

'THE TWA CORBIES'

By WILLIAM MONTGOMERIE

MR. DOUGLAS HAMER, in a short note on 'The Twa Corbies',¹ quotes two Scottish folk rhymes:

1. A hoggie dead! a hoggie dead! a hoggie dead!
Oh where? oh where? oh where?
Down i' e' park! down i' e' park! down i' e' park!
Is't fat? is't fat? is't fat?
Come try! come try! come try!

Galloway

2. Sekito says, there's a hogg dead!
Where? where?
Up the burn! up the burn!
Is't fat? Is't fat?
't's a' creesh! 't's a' creesh!

Tweeddale²

By limiting discussion to 'The Twa Corbies', and his evidence to printed Scottish folk rhymes, and by referring to 'the Scottish rustic habit of "interpreting the conversation" of carrion crows', Mr. Hamer ties up everything very neatly.

But interpreting the conversation of carrion crows is not a peculiarly Scottish rustic habit, nor is the rhyme a peculiarly Scottish rhyme. In 1894 it was noted down from the recitation of Robert Lawson of Thirlby at the foot of the Hambleton Hills in Yorkshire:³

CROW'S DITTY

Gowa! Gowa!
Whea teea? Whea teea?
Bagby Moor, Bagby Moor.
What ti dea there? What ti dea there?
Seek an au'd yeo, seek an au'd yeo.
Is she fat? Is she fat?
Glorr! Glorr! Glorr!

The penultimate line in all three rhymes suggests a common origin for all three, but affords no evidence at all for a Scottish or English source.

¹ *R.E.S.*, xxiii (1947), 354-5.

² Chambers, *Popular Rhymes of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 3rd edn., 1847), p. 165. My copy of the book gives 1841 as the date of the 3rd edition.

³ *Folk Lore*, v (1894), 342. The word 'recitation' does not exclude the possibility that the rhyme was sung.

Nor is the habit a peculiarly British one. A similar rhyme, which may safely be claimed as the same one, is recited in Germany:¹

(Krähen sprechen miteinander:)

Ligg'n Knaken, Ligg'n Knaken! —

Wonemb? Wonemb? —

Achter'n Barg, achter'n Barg!

Mit Fleisch, mit Fleisch! —

Puk em af, puk em af!

A variant was recorded in 1935, in Clear Island, south coast of Cork, by An t-Athair Donncha Ó Floinn:²

Do tharla dhá fhéich dhú' 'má chéile. D'iarthuigh ceann aca de cheann eil' aca:

'A' gcualais cá bhfuair a' seana-chapal bás?

'A' gcúntae 'n Chláir!

'Téimis fé n-a dhéin

'Un go líonaimid ár suiméar!

(Translation:

Two crows (ravens) met. One asked the other:

'Did you hear where the old horse died?'

'In County Clare!'

'Let us go there

That we may fill our stomachs!')

For Mr. Hamer, the two rhymes from *Popular Rhymes of Scotland* 'reveal a more certain origin for the form of this ballad'. He seems to imply that development, in this case at least, is from the simple folk rhyme to the more complex traditional ballad. It is not clear whether he further implies that this is the usual sequence of development.

It may be noted that an intermediate stage in this process of development has also been preserved:³

The corbie, wi' his rouspy throat,

Cried frae the leafless tree,

'Come owre the loch, come owre the loch,

Come owre the loch wi' me!'

¹ Maria Kühn, *Macht auf das Tor! Alte Deutsche Kinderlieder* (Königstein and Leipzig, 1942), p. 118.

² *Béaloideas*, v (1935), 135. For other Irish versions see *An Stoc*, March 1920, p. 5; and Sept.-Oct. 1927, p. 5. For these references I am indebted to Mr. Sean O'Sullivan, Archivist of the Irish Folklore Commission, Dublin. Compare also the Lancashire rhyme 'The Frog and the Crow' in *N. & Q.*, Series I, ii (1850), 222. I am informed that there are also a number of Scottish Gaelic parallels.

³ *Fifty Traditional Scottish Nursery Rhymes*. Collected, edited, and arranged for Voice and Piano by Alfred Moffat (Augener, London, n.d.), p. 29. The source of the collection was 'a manuscript collection of traditional Scottish airs . . . in the possession of a well known firm of booksellers in Edinburgh . . . written between the years 1845 and 1850'.

The craw put out his sooty head,
 And cried, 'Where to, where to?'
 'To yonder field,' the corbie cried,
 'Where there is corn enow.'

'The ploughman ploughed the land yestreen,
 The farmer sowed this morn,
 And we can mak' a full, fat meal,
 Frae off the broad-cast corn.'

The twa black birds flew owre the trees
 They flew towards the sun;
 The farmer watchin' by a hedge,
 Shot baith wi' his lang gun!

Line 2 of the second stanza is exactly equivalent to the second line of the Yorkshire rhyme, 'Whea teea? Wheea teea?' and is echoed, each time in the second line, in the Scottish and German rhymes, which suggests a direct connexion (by translation?) between the short rhymes.

There is still another version,¹ beginning with exactly the same first stanza, but with a significant development in the third:

Corbie. 'Te pike a dead man that's lying
 Ahint yon meikle stane.'

Craw. 'Is he fat, is he fat, is he fat, is he fat?
 If no, we may let him alane.'

Relying on the editor's information in the Contents, that the author is unknown, one might assume that this is the perfect transition version between rhyme and ballad (or ballad and rhyme), for it has elements of both. But Whitelaw in his *Book of Scottish Song* (Glasgow, 1875, p. 403) attributed this version to Alexander Carlile (1788-1860), who is known to have re-written others of our folk-songs (e.g. p. 368).

The true traditional ballad, folk-song, or folk-rhyme is anonymous. Such a criterion of authenticity is very chancy, especially in this case where the song could deceive the eye and ear of the expert in folk-song, whose ear, from experience, is not satisfied with 'wot' and 'new slain' in the line, 'I wot where lies a new slain knight', and the perfection, at another level of poetry, of the couplet

O'er his white banes, when they are bare,
 The wind sall blaw for evermair,

from 'The Twa Corbies' in Sir Walter Scott's *Minstrelsy*.

The theory of development from folk-rhyme to ballad is so satisfactory that one is tempted to leave Mr. Hamer's observation uncriticized. But

¹ R. A. Smith, *The Scottish Minstrel* (Edinburgh, 1824), vi. 62.

development in folk-song and rhyme is very seldom as tidy as that. There is some evidence suggesting another possibility.

Familiarity with such rhymes teaches one that many rhymes in oral tradition, manuscripts, and printed collections are fragments of largely forgotten songs and ballads. Sir Walter Scott quotes one of these rhymes in his *Minstrelsy* in the Notes on 'The Eve of St John':

Fair maiden Lylliard lies under this stane,
Little was her stature, but great was her fame;
Upon the English louns she laid mony thumps,
And, when her legs were cutted off, she fought upon her stumps.

This episode is alleged to have occurred at the battle of Ancrum Moor in 1545. But in the ballad called 'The Hunting of the Cheviot',¹ a similar episode is recorded:

For Wetharryngton my harte was wo,
that euer he slayne shulde be;
For when both his leggis wear hewyne In to,
yet he knyled & fought on his kny.

If this is the same story as 'The Battle of Otterburn', the accepted theory, it tells of a battle fought in 1388. The 'Hunttis of Chevet' is mentioned among the songs in *The Complaynte of Scotlande* (1549), but was old then. It is significant that the later version,² probably a broadside copy, is nearer the rhyme of Fair maiden Lylliard. Here is the corresponding stanza:

For witherington needs must I wayle
as one in too full dumpes,
For when his leggs were smitten of,
he fought vpon his stumpes.

The development in this case is not from rhyme to ballad, but from traditional ballad to broadside to rhyme. This seems to be the reverse of the process described by Mr. Hamer. It is possible that the rhyme of Fair maiden Lylliard may have been adapted, and incorporated in the second version of the ballad, but there is still the earlier version of the stanza to explain. To put it as late as 1545 leaves a gap of a century and a half between the event (1388) and the ballad about the event.

In this case the evidence seems to suggest a later date for the rhyme than for the ballad stanza, and it is as possible that in the case quoted by Mr. Hamer the same evolution took place from ballad to rhyme.

There is another example of the same process, which seems to be that

¹ MS. Ashmole 48 in the Bodleian, printed in Skeat's *Specimens of English Literature*, 1394-1579 (Oxford, 3rd edn. 1880), p. 67, st. 54.

² 'Chevy Chase' from Percy's MS., p. 188; Hales and Furnivall (London, 1867-8), ii. 7, st. 50.

of breaking down rather than building up. In the Bannatyne MS. is a poem¹ which has all the appearance of being a folk-poem, 'How the first Helandman of god was maid of Ane horse turd in argylle as is said'. I begin at the second stanza:

Sanct petir said to god,
in a sport word—
'Can 3e no^t mak a heilandman
of this horss tourd?'

God turnd owre þe horss turd
w^t his pykit staff,
And vp start a heilandman
blak as ony draff.

Qwod god to þe heilandman,
'Quhair wilt thou now?'
'I will doun in þe lawland, lord,
and thair steill a kow.'

'And thou steill A cow, cairle,
thair thay will hang the.'
'Quattrack, lord, of that,
ffor anis mon I die.'

The Rev. William Findlay (d. 1917), collecting from oral sources in the Lowlands of Scotland, recorded this:²

Can you mak a hiel'n'man?
Yes indeed an' that I can
Just as weel as ony man
He rummelt it, he tummelt it,
He gied it sik a blow
Up jumped a hiel'n'man
Crying *Trotsho!*

There is a Dumfries version of the same rhyme:³

Up Jock, doon Tam,
Blaw the bellows, auld man.
Peter cam tae Paul's door,
Playing on a Fife.
Can ye shape a Hielandman
Oot an auld wife?

¹ ff. 162b-163a. Written in eight long lines, without punctuation.

² Manuscript B, p. 82. All Mr. Findlay's MSS. are in my keeping.

³ *Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 1908-9, p. 55.

He rummelt her, he tummelt her,
 He gied her sic a blow,
 That oot cam a Hielandman
 Crying 'Trotshow'.

Another part of the poem in the Bannatyne MS. survived in Argyllshire till the late nineteenth century, and was recorded by R. C. Maclagan:¹

Whaur are ye gaun, my wee Johnnie Hielanman?
 I'm gaun awa to steal a wee coo.
 You'll be hanged, my fine Johnnie Hielanman,
 What do a care if my belly be fu'.

It would be very difficult to prove that these rhymes, picked up nearly 400 years later from the lips of the people, were the sources of ideas in the Bannatyne MS. poem. It is more likely that they are fragments from the poem, which have been modified in oral transmission through the centuries.

The positive value of Mr. Hamer's note is in drawing attention, once again, to the interconnexion between all kinds of material in oral tradition. The danger in the study of ballads is of becoming a prisoner within the ballad tradition, forgetting that it is an abstraction from the whole field of orally transmitted songs, singing games, nursery rhymes, folk-tales, folk-rhymes and proverbs, from which the folk themselves did not abstract the ballads, till the collectors asked them to do so. Professor Child's ballad collection consists very largely of ballads abstracted from manuscripts which contain many things beside ballads. The scholar who works within the limits of this printed collection² cannot but come, again and again, to the same conclusions as Child. Working with a full knowledge of the ballad manuscripts he must come at times to other conclusions than those of Child, who did not always see the complete ballad manuscripts, but only the traditional ballads extracted from them by his helpers.

¹ *The Games & Diversions of Argyllshire* (Folk-Lore Society, London, 1901), p. 256.

² Francis James Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Boston and New York, 5 vols., 1882-98). One danger in using the single-volume selection (Harrap, London, n.d.) for the ballad of 'The Twa Corbies' is a misplaced note about the other variants, whose existence proves that the *Minstrelsy* version is fundamentally traditional, even if touched up by Miss Erskine of Alva, Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe, or Sir Walter Scott. The variants are listed in the notes to No. 26 in the five-volume edition.

SIR JOHN HAYWARD, 'POLITIC' HISTORIAN

By S. L. GOLDBERG

THE main reason given in the sixteenth century for reading histories was the moral benefit to be derived from the examples of good and bad conduct in them. But although, as one writer put it at the time, 'the proems of *Historical Bookes* are . . . filled with discourses of the profitable vse that may be made of them', the proems had little necessary connexion with the contents. Scores of chronicles and 'manuals' proclaimed a moral value which still remains invisible. In historians like Grafton and Hall, and even Holinshed and Stow, edification is usually restricted to the irreproachable comments with which they adorn the tale. Yet there were some far-reaching effects of this concern with moral examples. For one thing, in the Renaissance history the individual counted for almost everything. Causation was conceived in terms of individual motives and aims, and the organization of a history fell naturally into the reigns of individual monarchs. Works as diverse as Holinshed's *Chronicle* and *The Mirror for Magistrates* illustrate these effects. But they also throw into high relief the relatively unsophisticated, moralized way in which human nature was regarded by the improving historian.

His terms of analysis were those of the preacher and the casuist. His judgements of men were implicit in the very descriptions of their natures. Richard II, for example, is described as one who 'ruled all by lust', who followed 'euill counsell' and practised 'insolent misgouernance and youthfull outrage'.¹ History is the history of individual characters; character is described in terms of morality; and everywhere is the Providence of God. Similarly, the advice of the historian on politics confused morality and analysis. When Amyot and Elyot, for example, attempt to explain events, they do not separate the moral and the political—private virtue leads to the wellbeing of the state; causes are again conceived in terms of moral philosophy. We may easily suppose that readers of such histories, if faced with a historian who analysed 'bad' men's actions without making his moral condemnation very clear, would be inclined to treat him as dangerous to the public order. This is partly what happened to John Hayward when, in 1599, he attempted a new approach to history in his *First Part of the Life and raigne of King Henrie the III.*

This new approach was heralded by Machiavelli, Bodin, and other

¹ The first phrase is from the *Mirror* (ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), p. 113); the others from Holinshed, *The Third volume of Chronicles* (London, 1587), pp. 507-8. There is no essential difference in their methods here.

Continental theorists; at the end of the sixteenth century it was advocated in England by Bacon (and later by Hobbes); and put into practice there most notably by Bacon himself, Raleigh, and Daniel. The change these men effected in the theory and practice of history was not, as has sometimes been suggested, a new emphasis on the use to which histories could be put by the politician. Rather, it was an untangling of the terminology of analysis from that of morality in both psychology and politics. The factual was separated from the moral: 'ought' and 'is' were seen to be different. Instead of discussing what princes ought to do in moral terms, the advocates of the new history sought to understand what they did in fact, how and why they did it, how effective their measures were. Only in this way, they recognized, could one 'get on' in the world of affairs. So Bacon and Hobbes, the English spokesmen of the new approach, stressed the practical uses to which the politician could put historical knowledge in his manipulation of men and affairs; they reached towards a realistic psychology, based very largely upon the evidence of history; they were concerned with the methods of administration and the rules (or 'maxims') of politics to be induced from the examples of the past; and they emphasized 'solid matter' rather more than elegance of style in the great classical historians.¹ This is the attitude to history advocated in Bacon's letter (written about 1595) to Fulke Greville: instead of collecting moral examples from his reading, he is to collect maxims, rules, and examples of political wisdom and public administration.²

To write the kind of history that would fulfil these demands on it—what we may call 'politic' history³—the historian would need to follow the methods of Machiavelli and Guicciardini: to set out the causes of events without importing moral preconceptions, to conjecture probable causes where direct evidence was lacking, to indicate the political importance of the events described, to show ability in unravelling the intrigues of the period in hand. The 'politic' historian had, therefore, to be a man with some experience of the behaviour of men in real life. Political experience, or at least political study, was regarded by those who wrote such history—Bodin, Bacon, Daniel, Fulke Greville—as an indispensable qualification.⁴

¹ Both Bacon and Hobbes have been discussed; for the former, see L. F. Dean, 'Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History Writing', *E.L.H.*, viii (1941), 161–83, and his 'Bodin's *Methodus* in England before 1625', *S.P.*, xxxix (1942), 160–6. For Hobbes, see Leo Strauss, *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes* (Oxford, 1936), chap. 6.

² The letter is probably by Bacon, though perhaps by Essex. It is printed in J. Spedding, *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon* (London, 1861–74), ii, 21–26.

³ For a brief discussion of this word in Elizabethan usage, see N. Orsini, '“Policy” or the Language of Elizabethan Machiavellianism', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, ix (1946), 122–34.

⁴ Jean Bodin, *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* (Lyons, 1583 (1st edn. 1566)), p. 38; Bacon, *Works*, ed. Spedding, Ellis, and Heath (London, 1870), vi, 291; S. Daniel,

Moreover, 'politic' history was an ideal training-ground for the crowds of young men seeking a career in politics, such as those described by Gabriel Harvey (himself one of them) at Cambridge at the end of the 1570's: 'rather active then contemplative philosophers', reading about courtly behaviour and politics in Guazzo, Castiglione, Plutarch, Guicciardini, Bodin, Machiavelli, and others, instead of logic and physics.¹

Although Raleigh and Bacon are the most famous of the English 'politicians', they were not the first. Probably the earliest 'politic' history written in England and on an English subject was John Hayward's *Henry IV* in 1599. The sombre, analytical spirit of the 'politic' writer pervades all Hayward's historical work. He is always concerned to probe beneath the surface of events, to show how the past illustrates the permanent realities of human nature and politics, and to draw conclusions about them. At the very beginning of *Henry IV* he sets out to explain the enmity between Edward III's sons, and his procedure here is characteristic:

for they that haue equall dignitie of birth and bloud, can hardly stoope to termes of soueraignty, but vpon euery offer of occasion wil aspire to indure, rather no equall then any superiour, and for the most part, the hatred of those that are neerest in kind, is most dispitfull & deadly if it once breake forth . . .

which he follows up with the Machiavellian examples of the Turkish tyrants and Romulus and Remus.² He always analyses his characters and treats them 'realistically' in terms of will and cunning and 'passions' rather than of moral intentions or states of mind. He has the 'politic' interest in intrigue as a fine art, and constantly interprets his sources in those terms:

King *Henry* thought it policie, rather to begin the warre in his enemies countrie, then to expect it in his owne, because the land which is the seate of the warre, dooth commonly furnish both sides with necessary supply; the friend by contribution, and the enemy by spoyle.³

He demonstrates the 'politician's' admiration for Tacitus by imitating many of his phrases—as Bacon, another keen admirer of Tacitus, pointed out.⁴ Indeed, Bacon and Hayward share the same aims and methods, as

The First Part of the Historie of England (London, 1612), sig. A2; for Greville, see the provisions of his lectureship at Cambridge in J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1873-1911), iii. 84. The same applied, of course, to the books of 'maxims of state' such as Raleigh's, and political analyses such as Sir John Davies's *Discouerie* (1612) on Ireland.

¹ Gabriel Harvey, *Letter-Book*, ed. E. J. L. Scott (London, Camden Society, 1884), pp. 78-80. Cf. Harvey's *Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart (London, 1884-5), i. 69.

² *Henry IV*, p. 2. These general maxims are also used by Daniel in his *Civil Wars* (1595), Book 1, st. 27.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 145-6.

⁴ *Works*, vii. 133.

well as the same virtues and faults as historians.¹ Yet, though Hayward was the first Englishman to write a 'politic' history, he has never had justice done to his achievement as a historian.

After leaving, in the early 1590's, the Cambridge described by Gabriel Harvey, Hayward achieved some success as a civilian. He became a Master in Chancery in 1616, was knighted in 1619, sat on the Court of High Commission in 1620 and 1625-6 and in Parliament in 1620 and 1626. He evidently enjoyed some favour at James's court, probably as the result of his political pamphlets, but he never really succeeded in achieving the political career he once hinted at.² Nor did he succeed in another aim—to write contemporary history,³ though he was appointed, with Camden, historiographer of Chelsea College in 1610.⁴ He wrote, in all, three histories: *Henry IV*, when he was about thirty-five; *The Lives of the III. Normans* (1613); and *The Life, and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth* (published in 1630, three years after his death). He left in addition an incomplete work on Elizabeth, not published in full until it was edited by John Bruce for the Camden Society as *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1840).

In all but the last of these he discussed the writing of history, but his two most important statements are elsewhere. The first comprises his answers to Coke and Popham in 1601, when he was arrested and questioned about *Henry IV*.⁵ It was suspected that the book was designed to help Essex, and Hayward was obliged to defend his right as a historian to comment freely on his material and add to it. He further claimed the right to invent 'reasons & speeches' because, as he put it, 'there can be nothing done be it never so ill or vnlawfull but must have a shadowe and eny counsell must be according to the action'.⁶ The invented speech and the invented character-portrait were among his methods of setting forth the policy and motives of the principal actors, which to Hayward were the causes of events. He obviously had his eye on classical models, and a

¹ L. F. Dean's comments on Hayward in his article in *E.L.H.*, viii. (1941), 167-8, seem to me to misinterpret Hayward. There is no reason to contrast him with Bacon; what has been said about Bacon's practice by W. Busch (*England under the Tudors*, tr. A. M. Todd (London, 1895), i. 416-23) could be said with equal truth of Hayward's.

² John Hayward, *A Reporte of a Discourse* (London, 1606), sig. H^v.

³ He spoke of this to Prince Henry in 1612 (see *Norman Kings*, sig. A3), but as early as June 1603 addressed a hitherto unnoticed letter to James, urging him to encourage contemporary history (Bodleian MS. Smith 70, pp. 24-25).

⁴ Thomas Fuller suggests that the Royalist views of the historiographers partially caused the failure of the College: see *The Church History*, ed. J. Nichols (London, 1868), III. x. 262 ff. Parliament probably found Hayward more objectionable than Camden.

⁵ He was imprisoned in the Tower from 13 July 1600 (*Acts of the Privy Council*, n.s. xxx, p. 499) probably until James's arrival in London in May 1603. His name appears as a prisoner up to Christmas 1602, but not in June 1603 (P.R.O. E407, 56).

⁶ *S.P.D.*, vol. cclxxviii, no. 17.

remark in the preface to *Henry IV* about the 'rude and barbarous English' of existing histories indicates that he aimed at reforming English practice in style as well as insight and method.

His second important statement forms the preface to Sir Roger Williams's *Actions of the Lowe Countries* (1618). Here he demands 'Order, Poysse and Truth' in histories. The second especially betrays the 'politician'. What he means by 'poysse' is a capacity in the writer to penetrate beyond the 'out-side' of events into the realities of policy and power, and therefore to separate the important events from 'those things which the popular multitude doe applaud', to make a connected story instead of a bare chronicle—in fact, that 'poysse' which distinguishes his own work and that of the 'politic' school.

His earliest attempt at the writing of history is somewhat immature, but nevertheless a brilliant development in English historiography. He derived all his facts for *Henry IV* from easily accessible sources, mainly Hall's *Vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of York and Lancaster* (1548), Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia* (1534), and Thomas Walsingham's chronicle, *Historia Anglicana*.¹ Hayward deals with them in accordance with his own purposes, however. For example, although he adopts something of Hall's theme of the 'unnatural deuision', he does not imitate Hall's moral ejaculations, as Holinshed does. Hayward's tone is more sophisticated, more curious. His method was to follow his sources for the outline of events but to add his own comments, conjecturing explanations and motives, shaping the details into a significant pattern as he went. Since he remained very close to his sources in this work, it is possible to see exactly how he treated them. One quotation may serve to demonstrate his methods. Whereas Walsingham's chronicle merely says that the nobility regarded the advancement of Richard's favourite, Robert de Vere, to the new title of Marquis of Dublin as favouritism unworthy of its object, Hayward generalizes from this one case to all of Richard's favourites:

But as they grew in honour, so did they in hate: for many noble men did infinitely stomacke their undeserued aduancements, and with these the fauour of the people generally went: but the kings intemperate affection was peremptory, and violent, not regarding enuy vntill he could not resist it.²

By reference to the character of the king and to politics as he has known them himself, Hayward has transformed Walsingham's simple version into

¹ Others mentioned by Hayward himself in his answers of 1601 (*C.S.P.D.*, 1598-1601, pp. 539-40) are Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, William of Malmesbury, and Bodin. We may add Tacitus; possibly Froissart. The part, if any, of Daniel's *Ciuil Wars* or Shakespeare's *Richard II* is too small for consideration. Holinshed seems to have been completely ignored.

² Thomas Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series, 1863-4), ii. 140; *Henry IV*, pp. 7-8.

both an explanation and an analysis of the general state of affairs. It is, of course, a shrewd conjecture—a typical mixture of guess and interpretation—but it is more penetrating than its source.

Hayward's final terms of explanation are the characters of the actors. He therefore constantly seeks out the trait to which an action may be referred, and rarely allows an actor to pass without comment. His portraits are perhaps more analytical than vivid, yet they are convincing in their very consistency. This applies particularly to the two main actors: Richard and Henry are played off, psychologically and politically, against each other—the one the rightful king but weak, the other an efficient, politic new prince, a mixture of Stoic and Machiavellian hero, for whom Hayward seems to have an undercurrent of sympathy. They are presented in antithesis. Even though the book has been mistaken for a history of Richard II, it is what it purports to be: the first part of a biography of Henry, in which is traced how 'the follies of the one, were either causes or furtherances of the fortunes of the other'.¹

The Lives of the III. Normans, Kings of England (1613) provided a safe, remote enough subject for a model of 'politic' English history to be written by a man of 'sufficiencie' or 'qualitie', with experience of public affairs, who could exercise his political insight and criticism.² Like *Henry IV* it cannot be called definitely either biography or history; in both, history is conceived biographically. But whereas in the earlier work Hayward relied in the main upon the narrative pattern of Hall, in the *Norman Kings* he constructs his own. He now displays an increased mastery, derived from his possession of a secure point of view and his assurance in interpretation.³ Each of the three chapters or lives is centred upon the character of the protagonist. Hayward abandons a purely chronological arrangement of his material in favour of a 'rational' one, so that he is able to trace the interplay of character and event as he wishes, and thus interpret his material with greater freedom and subtlety than in the earlier work.

His methods can perhaps be best examined in the life of William I. After dealing with the troubles of William's early years, he turns to con-

¹ *Henry IV*, p. 5.

² Dedication, sigs. A2-A2^v. The dedication to Prince Charles reports Hayward's conversations with Prince Henry about history. Henry died just after Hayward presented him with the *Norman Kings* and the fragment of the *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*. These conversations must have taken place before August 1612, when Henry left on his last progress; by that time the two works were probably almost completed.

³ There is, indeed, a certain carelessness over facts, as William Nicolson pointed out in his *English, Scotch and Irish Historical Libraries* (London, 1736), p. 76. Possibly Hayward was in haste to finish the book for Prince Henry; perhaps he had a certain disdain for mere accuracy. His main sources were Savile's *Scriptores* (1596), Camden's *Anglica... Scripta* (1603) and *Britannia*, Polydore Vergil, Holinshed, Speed, and the chronicles of Matthew of Westminster, Matthew Paris, and William of Newburgh—all readily available to him.

sider the young Duke's character: 'generous and aspiring', active, ambitious, able. He then proceeds to illustrate this in a further section of narrative, until William is about to engage in English politics. We are then given another view of him—a man whom unruly subjects and military life have toughened and developed. What emerges as new and original in Hayward's work at this point is his clear realization that such interplay between character and event was continuous and crucial—'his cruelty made the people rebellious, and their rebellions made him the more cruel'.¹ Once William is on the English throne, the narrative again stops and his character is again examined, this time to show how it influenced policy and government:

He talked little and bragged lesse: a most assured performer of his word: In prosecution of his purposes constant and strong, and yet not obstinate; but always applicable to the change of occasions: earnest, yea violent, both to resist his enemies, and to exact duties of his Subjects. He neither loued much speech, nor gaue credit to faire; but trusted truely to himselfe, to others so farre as he might not be abused by credulitie.²

Hayward's admiration goes as far as the Carlylean judgement that he was 'in most of his actions commendable, and excusable in all'.³

In his analysis of politics, Hayward abandons the pretence of narrating all the events. Instead, he poses two questions that for a 'politic' writer went to the root of the matter: how did a mere Duke of Normandy prevail over the King of England? and how did he manage to seat the Normans so securely on the throne that they could not be dislodged? Here again Hayward's work marks a significant advance. He is now led to trace connexions between seemingly unrelated things: between the pro-Norman policy of Edward the Confessor and the strength of Papal influence; between the divisions in the English nobility and William's power; between William's early struggles in France and the military superiority of the Normans. In probing the success of William's domestic policy, he ends with William's firm hand, his capacity, his 'policy', developed throughout his life: Hayward, as always, looks finally for his explanations to the character of the prince acting within the circumstances of the time.

The *Norman Kings* inevitably invites comparison with another 'politic' history of the Normans. Daniel's *Historie* appeared in 1612, Hayward's in 1613;⁴ they make similar interpretations of Rufus and Henry and even use similar phrases; both put very similar questions to their material.⁵

¹ *Norman Kings*, p. 91.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 107-8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 122; cf. p. 46.

⁴ For a critical account of Daniel from a rather different point of view see M. McKisack, 'Samuel Daniel as Historian', *R.E.S.*, xxiii (1947), 226-43.

⁵ On Rufus, cf. *Norman Kings*, pp. 153-5, 157, &c., with *Historie*, pp. 149-50; on Henry, cf. *Norman Kings*, pp. 232-5, 279 ff., &c., with *Historie*, pp. 171-2 (here Daniel

There may have been influence one way or the other, but their similarities of approach and technique are those shared by the 'politic' writers as a group. Both discard the annalistic method in favour of a connected story; both preserve a critical attitude to their sources (though Daniel more so than Hayward); both are interested in problems of government. If Daniel shows a greater interest in social history, he disregards ecclesiastical history; and if he is more concerned with accuracy and documentation, he does not show the remarkable flexibility in organization that enables Hayward to avoid separating his narrative from his analysis of problems and policies. Indeed, the *Norman Kings* rivals Bacon's *Henry VII* as the finest product of the school.

Although Hayward was always interested in writing contemporary history, the unfinished *Elizabeth* was the nearest he ever got to it. We may suppose that he knew of Camden's annals of Elizabeth (though they were not yet complete in 1612) and of the official backing Camden had received. Nevertheless, he might have felt that there was room for a work such as a 'politician' could write—not as detailed in information as Camden's, perhaps, but interpretative; based on more than Holinshed's superficial facts, but freer in arrangement and more classically formed than Camden's. Perhaps he was also making a bid for official backing himself. In any case, the fragment he wrote has just those positive qualities. Although the form is annalistic, each book is organized around a central problem, while the whole is organized to show how each problem led naturally to the next. It differs from his earlier histories, however, in that the character of the prince is not of the same central importance; fine though the portrait of Elizabeth herself is, it is not at the centre of the design. Hayward seems to have thought—as far as we can infer from what exists of the work—that Elizabeth was less of a policy-maker, a discoverer of solutions, than the Normans or even Richard II or Henry IV had been; that she had to implement policies laid down earlier, to steer through the reefs but not to set the course. If this were Hayward's implication, it explains why he abandoned the biographical form of his earlier histories, for biography would not illuminate the age as much as analysis of the problems she had inherited and the dangers she had to avoid.

The Life, and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth is the only history in which Hayward relies to any extent upon manuscript material,¹ and the

makes explicit what is implicit in Hayward's account). On the questions they pose, cf. *Norman Kings*, p. 45, with *Historie*, p. 69.

¹ This was the collection of MSS. now contained in B.M. MS. Cotton Nero C. x, and reprinted in John Nichols, *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth* (London, Roxburghe Club, 1857), ii. 209 ff., 498–502, 504–10, 539–41, 552–5. Hayward acknowledges his debt to Cotton for the material and says he will make it 'the ground of this historie' (*Ed. VI*, p. 3), but there is a good deal of Holinshed in the final product. Other

only one to be taken seriously enough by a later scholar to be harshly criticized.¹ The book falls into sections of two kinds—those in which he interprets and shapes material taken from his printed sources, and those in which he relies almost entirely on his manuscripts. The narrative portions are devoted to his two main themes: the one, the benefits of the Union under James and the deserved failure of the abortive attempts to force union under Edward VI; and the other, handled in terms reminiscent of *Henry IV*, the struggle for power between the weak-minded Somerset—for whose ineffectiveness and lack of ‘policy’ Hayward has nothing but contempt—and the unscrupulous, cunning, and energetic Warwick. With these two themes he is able to improve on Holinshed by the usual devices of comment, analysis of policy and character, and remodelling of style. On the other hand, his understandable but unfortunate enthusiasm for his manuscripts led him into a fault he usually escapes—he blurs the outlines of his work and makes less than a whole of it. He does not treat his manuscripts as sacrosanct; he exercises an intelligent criticism, as in the following small example:

Edward’s Journal: ‘To Devonshier the Lord Previ-seal, who with his band, being but smal, lay at Honington. . . .’

Hayward: ‘To *Deuonshire* was sent *Iohn Lord Russell, Lord of the priuy seale*, whose forces being indeed, or being by him distrusted to be inferior to the importance of the service, he sate downe at *Honington*. . . .’²

And if he does not distinguish between the original and his own comment, invents a speech or two, occasionally gets a detail wrong, and almost always neglects chronology, these things are characteristic. His heavy reliance on the manuscripts and his use of them to correct Holinshed show that he realized their value and used them as fairly and significantly as he could. Yet when he turned aside from the narrative, where he could rely on printed sources for an outline, and devoted himself entirely to the manuscript material, he seems to have changed his conception of history altogether.

He had always recognized that selection was one of the most important duties of the historian. In *Edward VI* itself he excuses himself from inserting all the Acts of Parliament on the ground that, unless they occasion trouble or alteration in the State, ‘the relation of them [is] both fruitlesse & improper for a true caryed history’.³ The conception underlying his

major sources were Wm. Patten’s *Expedicion* (1548); Stow’s *Annals* (1592) and *Survey* (1598); Grafton’s *Chronicle* (1569); Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments*; and Nicholas Sander’s *De Origine ac progressu schismatis anglicani* (1585).

¹ By John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (London, 1733), II. ii. 28.

² Nichols, II. 229; *Ed. VI*, p. 55.

³ *Ed. VI*, p. 47.

earlier works is that a history is a useful exercise in psychological and political insight. The manuscript material in *Edward VI*, however, is evidently given the reader for other reasons. He includes a long discussion on a proposed English mart, for example, because the arguments 'may giue some light to the like question, which in times ensuing may happily againe be set on foot';¹ and on the same grounds he excludes certain administrative details—'matters now altogether of no vse'.² Thus *Edward VI* is more of a record of useful information than any of his other works. It is also, in its treatment of Somerset and Warwick, something of a 'politic' history as well; but the two kinds are not happily joined.

It was perhaps because he mistook one kind for the other that John Strype, the eighteenth-century historian, was led to criticize *Edward VI* so sharply for its critical portraits, lack of chronology, conjectures of fact, and fictitious speeches.³ Strype did not share Hayward's view of what belonged to a 'true caryed history'. He attacked, for example, what he believed to be anti-Protestant bias, when it ought to have been clear that Hayward was merely exercising his right as a 'politic' historian to question the methods and even the motives of political and religious reforms. Hayward never suggests that Somerset's reforms were bad in themselves—quite the contrary. But as a 'politician' he judged them by reference to political expediency as much as religious truth—in regard to its 'outward Affaires', the Church is 'but a member and part of the Common-wealth'.⁴

For the 'politic' historian, to write history was to call the past to a political judgement, 'iudiciously consider the defects in counsaile, or obliquitie in proceeding',⁵ and hence to seek the motives and circumstances of action. In a period when source-material was limited, he had to conjecture most of the time, but conjecture was more illuminating than silence. Thus Hayward evidently thought it better to paint in what must have been the background of alarm and 'strange confusione of conceits' on Elizabeth's succession, even though the chroniclers had not, since it provided a necessary element in explanation of the early moves of her government.⁶ The same applies to the arrangement of facts into explanatory character studies. And finally, to show how character and circumstances interacted, he used the general rules derived from his reading and experience, his 'maxims'.

¹ *Ed. VI*, p. 149.

² *Ibid.*, p. 155.

³ Strype also attacks some of Hayward's facts, but he is, in almost every case, as mistaken about Hayward's sources as about his methods of using them. If there is any bias in the matter, it is Strype's—his account of Hayward's life distorts the facts and is unjustifiably unpleasant in tone.

⁴ His attitude in *Edward VI* is the same as in his pamphlets on the Royal Supremacy—*A Reporte of a Discourse* (1606) and *Of Supremacie* (1624). The quotation above is from the latter, sigs. F3^v–F4.

⁵ Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London, 1614), II. xxi. 6, p. 536.

⁶ *Elizabeth* (1840), pp. 1–2.

These maxims fell almost inevitably into short, concise, pithy sentences, weighty with the authority of digested experience: 'in opposition of . . . equall powers, there is many times small difference in harme'; 'likenesse is a great cause of liking and of loue';² 'so effectuall is celeritie for the benefit of a seruice, that oftentimes it more auaieth, then either multitude or courage of Souldiers'.³ The 'politician's' heavy reliance on this form was the result of his general outlook, and it became the most marked feature of his style. Further, his admiration for the curt Tacitus and the sententious Seneca was partly a cause and partly an effect of this stylistic tendency—the 'Anti-Ciceronian' models seemed to offer a style admirably suited to men who aimed at psychological realism and the 'poyse' of political experience in their own work and who admired strong and self-reliant heroes like William I, and Henry IV, and Henry VII.⁴ Certainly 'poyse' in matter and style was an ideal Hayward set himself. In 1618 he praised Sir Roger Williams for his 'Souldiers stile, sinowie and sweet; full both of perspicuities and grace', and again in 1622 he criticized 'form-lesse vnsinewie writings'.⁵ Brevity was to be combined with perspicuity; the sinewy was not to become the muscle-bound. When Hayward uses the conciseness, the short members, the balance and antithesis of the 'curt' style, it is not merely a fashion but another aspect of his thought. His conciseness gives the reader the impression of a subject untangled for him, the irrelevant ruthlessly cut away. He employs antithesis for a variety of purposes. A few years after his death, another 'politician', Hobbes (introducing Thucydides, 'the most Politique Historiographer that euer writ'), said of antithesis that 'as it is in some kind of speech, a very great vice, so it is not vnproper in Characters; and of comparatiue discourses, it is almost the onely Stile'.⁶ This is exactly the case with Hayward. At times he seems to have indulged in verbal balance for its own sake; at times he shows a rather irritating fondness for balanced conjunctions; but for the most part it serves the matter: to contrast opponents like Richard II and Henry IV, or William I and Harold, or Somerset and Warwick; to present the alternative policies open to a character; to distinguish different aspects of an action or situation. Like all these stylistic devices, it is a quality of his thought, giving clarity and precision to his analyses and his narrative.

Generally, however, he writes without exploiting such forms. The main

¹ *Henry IV*, p. 13.

² *Norman Kings*, p. 95.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁴ The most useful book I have seen on Tacitus as historian is Edmond Courbaud, *Les Procédés d'art de Tacite dans les 'Histoires'* (Paris, 1918). Courbaud's description of Tacitus's methods could often be applied word for word to that of the English 'politicians'.

⁵ The former is from his preface to Williams's *Actions of the Lowe Countries*, sig. A2; the latter from an interesting personal statement in his own *Dauids teares* (1622), sig. A8.

⁶ *Eight Bookes of the Peloponnesian Warre* (London, 1629), sig. b.

body of his narrative is in a looser, more connected style, vigorous and straightforward, easy to read, but capable of adaptation to the needs of the moment—here breaking up into sententious brevity, there flowing rapidly over a series of events. In his last work there is a rather lengthier sentence structure, less reliance on colons and semicolons, a freer movement generally: a stylistic development that seems to have been typical of other Anti-Ciceronians, like Bacon, as well.

Hayward's main artistic successes are the result of his 'politic' insight and his intelligent approach to the past. The economical structure of *Norman Kings* and *Elizabeth* and the pattern of *Henry IV* are artistically satisfying because they clarify and illuminate the subject-matter. They have the strength of the consciously ordered history in comparison with the naïve chronicle. Whether they provide historically valid insights is another matter. We may agree that Hayward (and even the other 'politicians', Raleigh and Daniel and Bacon) had little to add to the *matter* of history; and any influence Hayward may have had is negligible. Yet to neglect him and the school to which he belonged is impossible, for the art and intelligence in their work added necessary qualities to the writing of history. Their 'politic' approach and methods led them to a genuine if limited insight into character and politics. After them, it was possible to be free of slavish repetition of the chronicler's facts, to exercise critical speculation about them, to interpret and shape them, to be free from the preacher's moral intent. Obviously, however, a method of criticism for the source-material itself, such as the antiquaries were beginning to provide, was also needed before history could combine Science with Art.

ANTIOCHUS'S RIDDLE IN GOWER AND SHAKESPEARE

By P. GOOLDEN

IN Act 1, Scene 1 of *Pericles* King Antiochus, in order to maintain his incestuous relationship with his daughter, sets a riddle for prospective suitors. Candidates accept the challenge of the riddle on the condition that they lose their heads if they fail. The riddle is as follows:

I am no viper, yet I feed
On mother's flesh which did me breed;
I sought a husband, in which labour
I found that kindness in a father.
He's father, son, and husband mild,
I mother, wife, and yet his child.
How they may be, and yet in two,
As you will live, resolve it you.¹

Lines 3-4 are self-explanatory and give the answer: the *I* is Antiochus's daughter and she refers to her incestuous liaison with her father. In lines 1-2 she puts it in another way: her mother's flesh which she feeds on is her father because his is flesh which belongs rightly to her mother.

The only difficulty occurs in lines 5-6: the words *son* and *mother* do not obviously fit into the general scheme. (*He's father . . . and husband mild* and *I . . . wife and yet his child* restate the previous points.) It is not certain that they were felt to make sense, as will be seen later, but it can be forced on to them by including *in-law* relationships with the simple terms, a use not unparalleled in Shakespeare.² Antiochus, by marrying his daughter, not only makes her his wife but he also makes himself his new wife's (and his own) son-in-law. Hence *He's son* and conversely *I mother*. The chain of reasoning is specious to say the least of it, but it is the only one which can give any sense to the clues.

Apart from these two details the general meaning of the riddle is moderately simple to discover. Dramatically this simplicity is not objectionable: it is superficially complex enough to serve the general purpose of the scene; but logically it seems too easy, especially as a long succession of suitors, who were presumably of normal intelligence, all failed to solve it. When we compare the form of the riddle in Gower, from which the *Pericles* version derives, we can see how far off the derivative version is from the far more convincing form which was originally intended. A comparison of the two will show why and how this simplification took place.

¹ I. i. 64 ff.

² See C. T. Onions, *A Shakespeare Glossary*, under 'son'.

The best way of interpreting Gower's version, which is extraordinarily obscure, is to see it in relation to the Latin original. It is, moreover, further complicated by the fact that it is based on a Latin version which is corrupt. With the answer of the original to hand we can just see what sense has been carried through into Gower. After that the form which we have in *Pericles* can be fully explained.

The earliest form of the riddle appears in the medieval Latin prose romance *Apollonius of Tyre*.¹ Over a hundred manuscripts still survive and several contain corrupt versions of the riddle; but the best manuscripts read: 'Scelere vehor, materna carne vescor, quaero fratrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filium; non invenio.' ('I am carried along by crime, I feed on my mother's flesh, I seek my brother, my mother's husband, my wife's son and I do not find.') Here the speaker is not the daughter, as in *Pericles*, but Antiochus; and the result is a complicated tangle. Throughout *in-law* relationships are to be identified with the simple terms, as we have already seen in the two particulars which stand out from the rest in *Pericles*.²

In the following analysis I mark the separate clues (a), (b), (c), &c., in order to facilitate cross-reference and to avoid repeating explanations which have to be carried through to succeeding stages.

(a) The first clause is plain enough: *Scelere vehor*. The second is less easy (b): *materna carne vescor*. By marrying his daughter Antiochus makes her two people, wife and daughter. As wife she becomes the mother-in-law of her husband as daughter. Antiochus, therefore, as that husband, feeds on his mother's (mother-in-law's) flesh. The remaining parts are to be interpreted according to the same principle: they all refer to the daughter's future husband. (c) *Quaero fratrem meum*: Antiochus in supposedly seeking a husband for his daughter seeks also a brother-in-law, since she is now his wife. (d) *Meae matris virum*: the potential husband would also be the husband of Antiochus's mother-in-law since the daughter has already been

¹ Ed. A. Riese, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Leipzig, 1893).

² This *in-law* key for the *Apollonius* riddle was proposed by S. Singer, *Apollonius von Tyros: Untersuchungen über das Fortleben des antiken Romans in spätern Zeiten* (Halle, 1895), pp. 38-39. Apart from this treatment I can find no explanation of the riddle. All editors of the various texts in which it appears in English seem to be baffled by it. Macaulay's note on the passage in Gower is: 'I do not attempt a solution beyond that of Apollonius.' Apollonius is in fact most unhelpful: 'Quod dixisti "scelere vehor", non es mentitus, ad te ipsum respice. Et quod dixisti "materna carne vescor", filiam tuam intueri' (MS. Laud 247). Or, in Gower's words:

The question which thou hast spoke,
If thou wolt that it be unloke,
It toucheth al the privete
Betwen thin oghne child and thee,
And stant al hol upon you tuo. (*Confessio Amantis*, viii. 423-7.)

The general answer is offered here, but how it is obtained is not explained.

shown to be his mother-in-law. (e) *Uxoris meae filium*: the husband would finally be the son-in-law of Antiochus's wife, the wife and daughter being one. (f) *Non invenio*: he cannot find such a husband for his daughter because no one can solve the riddle in order to qualify, and, moreover, he has already assumed that position.

This is indeed complex, and it is no wonder that Apollonius resorted to checking his solution by consulting 'the riddles of all the philosophers and all the Chaldeans' (*quaestiones omnium philosophorum omniumque Chaldaeorum*).¹

The next stage of the riddle is to be seen in the corrupt text which Gower used as the source of the Eighth Book of the *Confessio Amantis*.² It is as follows: 'Scelere vehor, materna carne vescor, quaero patrem meum, matris meae virum, uxoris meae filium.'³ It will be seen that this version is the same as the original except for the corruption *patrem* for *fratrem* (and the omission of the last clause *non invenio*). The same interpretation therefore applies except for this corruption. *Quaero patrem meum* (c 1) instead of *quaero fratrem meum* (c) contains the idea that the future

¹ Riese, op. cit., p. 9, lines 4-5.

² He avowedly used Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon* which contains a Latin verse form of the story:

Of a cronique in daies gon
The which is cleped Pantheon
In loves cause I rede thus. (viii. 271 ff.)

But this is not literally true: his version corresponds in many places to passages in the prose versions which are not included in the *Pantheon*. Among these is the riddle, which is omitted in Godfrey of Viterbo's version.

³ This form appears in the Latin marginal notes to the *Confessio Amantis*. This version, with the exception of the omission of the last clause, *non invenio*, agrees with several of the Latin manuscripts in the alteration of *fratrem* to *patrem* (e.g. C.C.C.C. 318; Laud 247). It may be of incidental interest to note that the Old English version of the riddle also contains this corruption. It contains two others as well, *filiam* for *filium*, and *vereor* for *vehor*. The riddle reads therefore: 'Scelere vereor, materna carne vescor. Quaero patrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filiam nec invenio.' This is translated: 'Scylde ic polige, moddrenum fæste ic bruce. . . . Ic sece minne fæder, mynre modor wer, mines wifes dohtor and ic ne finde.' The corruption *filiam* (*dohtor*) has completely altered the clues of the riddle. The ingenuity of the second part of the original version (*quaero* onwards) lies in the fact that reference is made to the same person (the daughter's future husband) in each of the three different cases. The introduction of *filiam* (*dohtor*) makes this impossible. Either this clue was not understood and the rest was interpreted as above (the slip *vereor* for *vehor* is of small consequence) or, more likely, it had the effect of transforming the whole idea of the clues of the riddle, making it simpler. The possible new solution would be on the following lines: instead of one subject (Antiochus) there are two (Antiochus and his daughter). *Scelere vereor* has Antiochus as speaker. In *materna carne vescor* his daughter is the imagined speaker. *Quaero patrem meum* and *meae matris virum* are still the daughter's words. *Uxoris meae filiam* reverts to Antiochus as the speaker. Neither can find the person they seek because by their new association they have destroyed their old relationship. It is interesting to observe that this interpretation lies half-way between the true original Latin form and the version in *Pericles*: the original has Antiochus exclusively as the speaker, the Anglo-Saxon has both Antiochus and his daughter, *Pericles* has exclusively the daughter.

husband, whom Antiochus seeks for his daughter, would not be, as originally, his brother-in-law, but his father-in-law, because his daughter, as we have already seen, is also his mother-in-law; her husband would therefore be his father-in-law. This corruption makes possible sense, but it is less good than *fratrem* for the simple reason that it redundantly repeats the following clue, *meae matris virum*.

Gower had this slightly corrupt Latin version before him. His translation is as follows:

With felonie I am upbore,
I ete and have it noght forbore
Mi modres fleissch, whos housebonde
Mi fader forto seche I fonde,
Which is the sone ek of my wif.
Hierof I am inquisitif;
And who that can mi tale save,
Al quyt he schal my doghter have.

The first section is clear enough. The first two and a half lines are plainly *scelere vehor* (a) and *materna carne vescor* (b) and are to be interpreted in the same way. When we come to the part (*quaero* onwards) which names the three people who, though different, turn out to be the same person (the daughter's husband), Gower's version is less immediately clear.

whos housebonde
Mi fader forto seche I fonde

corresponds to *quaero patrem meum, meae matris virum* (c, d). It should first be said that *I fonde* does not mean *I found* and is not a mistranslation of *nec invenio*. It means *I try* (OE. *fandian*); the construction with *forto* and the infinitive is regular (cf. 'I wole it fonde for to selle', v. 5107). The rendering of *quaero* by *I try to seek* is quite in order, the conative idea being implicit in the context. *Whos* refers to the mother (*mi modres*) of the previous clause and avoids repeating it. It meant, however, transposing the clauses *quaero patrem meum, meae matris virum* to *quaero meae matris virum, patrem meum* in order to place *meae matris* at the beginning. *Whos* could then translate it and refer back to *mi modres* which precedes.

'Which is the sone ek of my wif' translates *uxoris meae filium*, the third in the equated list (e).

Gower's version is, therefore, an accurate translation of the words of the Latin source. This has already been explained, and the same explanation may be applied to Gower's translation. One wonders whether Gower did any more than reproduce the words themselves; whether he penetrated to the dark meaning underneath is open to conjecture.

The next stage of the riddle is that in *Pericles*. This has been quoted

already. We may now see how it has gone astray.¹ It is certain that Shakespeare or George Wilkins, whichever was the author of this part of *Pericles*,² was floored by the meaning of the clues as they stood in Gower, and no wonder: the original Latin is difficult enough; the Middle English translation, though correct, obscures it even more. We must give Gower the benefit of the doubt, but if he was guilty of translating what he did not properly understand Shakespeare (Wilkins) was more honest with himself than he was. (Some other touches to the *Pericles* version also point to a more positive approach.) The author of *Pericles* was not satisfied with reproducing words that made no sense to him. Adjustments had to be made which might preserve the same general answer and at the same time make the clues understandable. This was achieved, as mentioned above, by making the daughter instead of Antiochus the speaker of the riddle. This change was not made without juggling with one of the clues, but it is remarkable how easily the rest of them lent themselves to this reorientation.

The first two lines in Gower are ambiguous as to who is the speaker and therefore the *Pericles* version makes them fit quite well with the daughter's words:

I am no viper, yet I feed
On mother's flesh, which did me breed

reproduces Gower's first lines:

With felonie I am upbore,
I ete and have it noght forbore
Mi modres fleissch . . . (a), (b).

The allusion to the viper eating its parents is an added embellishment and replaces Gower's first line. It could, of course, only be added if the daughter was the speaker.

The next two lines carry on the daughter's words:

I sought a husband in which labour
I found that kindness in a father.

This is very much a simplification of

whos housebonde
My fader forto seche I fonde (d), (c).

¹ One source of this play was Twine's *The Patterne of Painfull Adventures*, a translation of the Latin version contained in the *Gesta Romanorum*. As far as the riddle is concerned this was not the source, since it was based on the correct form with *fratrem* instead of *patrem*: 'I am carried with mischiefe, I eate my mothers flesh: I seeke my brother, my mothers husband and I cannot finde him.'

² The form of the riddle is the same in *Pericles* and in Wilkins's novel *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, which was printed in 1608, the year before the first printed edition of the play appeared.

The key word for the change lies in Gower's use of *whos*. We have seen that *whos housebonde* translates *meae matris virum* (*d*). *Whos* therefore refers to the mother, but in *Pericles* it has been made to refer to the daughter, the *I* of the previous clause. Instead of the meaning in Gower, 'I (Antiochus) sought her (my mother's) husband, my father' (*d*), (*c* 1), *Pericles* has 'I (the daughter) sought a husband and found a father'. One can see the connexion between the two versions: once the notion that the daughter is the speaker is accepted the readjustment of the clues inevitably follows.

He's father, son, and husband mild,
I mother, wife, and yet his child

repeats the previous statement and also includes Gower's next line: 'Which is the sone ek of my wif'. *He's son* and *I mother* are the words which correspond to 'Which is the sone ek of my wif'. This is the only part of the *Pericles* version which has deliberately distorted the source in order to make it fit. 'Which is the sone ek of my wif' (*uxoris meae filium*) (*e*) is Antiochus's reference to his daughter's husband being, on account of his own marriage with her, her son-in-law. Shakespeare (or Wilkins) found himself in trouble here. So far the daughter has been taken as the speaker. How then, if this is to be continued, can she talk about the son of *my wife*? The only possible course was to suppress *of my wife* and to make the son her own son and have him refer, as in the clues before, to Antiochus. Hence *He's son* and conversely *I mother*. Early in this article it was shown that the *in-law* key was the only way of making these two clues yield sense. It was also suggested that this interpretation was not necessarily the one the author had in mind. In fact, they could have been mechanically reproduced from the source without scrupulous inquiry into their exact meaning. The reason for this doubt lies in the extraordinary coincidence it would be if all the other clues were distorted because this *in-law* key was not discovered, while here two clues, which are deliberate alterations to the original in order to avoid an absurdity, should fall into line with the original spirit of the riddle elsewhere disregarded. It is not unlikely that in the clause 'Which is the sone ek of my wif' the words *of my wif* were extracted to avoid obvious nonsense and the rest were made to refer to Antiochus in the same way as the previous clues, and the exact sense was left to look after itself.

Such is the history of the riddle in its main English forms. Any explanation of it tends to get tied up in the knots which it attempts to disentangle, but it is possible to trace the threads if they are scrutinized carefully. The general results may be summarized as follows. The riddle in its original Latin form was a hard nut to crack. Antiochus presents a series of clues which are extremely far-fetched references to the various relationships with

his daughter which are incurred by his secret marriage to her. Gower, using a poorer reading, translated his source correctly; the same interpretation can therefore be applied to his version, though it is uncertain whether he really understood it. The third stage was reached in *Pericles*. Here a complete transformation has taken place: the clues were reshaped to make them comprehensible. Although it is remarkable how little deliberate alteration there is, the clues need a completely different key for their interpretation. The result is mercifully easier and one which serves its purpose perfectly well in its dramatic context.

THE QUARTOS AND THE FOLIO TEXT OF *KING LEAR*

By ANDREW S. CAIRNCROSS

I PROPOSE to examine, as it affects the textual theory of *King Lear*, a standing assumption—or rather a complex of assumptions—that seems to me to have led Shakespearean criticism astray for too long.

It has been and is still assumed that, when a quarto is known to have been used as basis or copy for the First Folio text, this was done with the knowledge and approval of the Company, and its chief agents, Heminge and Condell. They are supposed to have handed over to Jaggard as exemplar a copy of the quarto which had been used as a prompt-book in the theatre; or collated a quarto with their own manuscript (whether the so-called 'foul papers' or a 'fair copy' of them); or allowed an agent of the printers to make such a collation, whether in the theatre or in the printing-house. On occasions when one or more pages of a manuscript prompt-book or of a prompt-quarto were wanting or defective, the gap was filled, so the argument runs, either by the Company for its own use or by the printers for theirs, with a 'patch' consisting of the corresponding pages from one edition or other of the quarto. Or again, the printers, finding part of a play-house manuscript illegible or defective, 'patched' in the same way, using, or at least consulting, the relevant pages of a quarto. The fundamental assumption is that of *one* physical quarto (single, or composite) or copy, used by authority. This view extends to the two 'doubtful' quartos, *Richard III* and *King Lear*,¹ which are held to contain, like the Bad quartos, memorial matter, but to have been compiled by the members of the Company, and to have been delivered by the Company to the F printers, along with an authoritative manuscript from which to make any necessary corrections—unless, of course, the corrections had already been made in the theatre.

This view, as applied to the 'doubtful' quartos, was restated as recently as 1953 by Dr. Alice Walker.² Of *Richard III* she says, 'The collation of the manuscript with Q6 was, I judge, undertaken at Heminge and Condell's direction.'³ Where another quarto, Q3, is known to have been used as part of the copy for F, she says, 'Shakespeare's autograph was found to be defective and was patched up by incorporating leaves from a playhouse marked quarto',⁴ and F was printed from this 'composite' copy. Similarly,

¹ W. W. Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1955), ch. iv.

² *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Cambridge).

³ p. 20.

⁴ p. 35.

for *Lear*, 'The fact that Q1 (and not Jaggard's 1619 reprint) was used for the Folio points, at any rate as far as this play is concerned, away from Jaggard.'¹ Now in fact more than one quarto can be shown to have been used in several F plays where the one-quarto theory at present holds; and where two or more quartos have been used, as in *Richard III*, it seems to me to point to and not away from Jaggard. I confine myself for the present to *King Lear*.

The one-quarto assumption for *Lear* may be found at its most obvious in the work of Daniel;² and his treatment of the textual problem offers the easiest and most direct line of attack. The F text of *Lear* has the further advantage, from this point of view, that it was set up by one compositor, the one known as B.³ The case, then, is sufficiently compact and self-contained to allow free consideration of the implication of the use, for F, of the two quartos—Q1, printed by Nathaniel Butter in 1608; and Q2 printed by Jaggard for Pavier in 1619. The latter, as Dr. Walker implies, is the quarto one would have expected Jaggard to use when he printed the First Folio in 1623.

It was Daniel who first marshalled the evidence for the use of corrected quarto copy in the setting up of the Folio text—evidence drawn from Q1 and Q2. Having presented the evidence from Q1, however, he abandoned all critical method and fell back on an unexamined assumption, with the naïve remark, 'There are many points of resemblance between the F and Q2 which must not be overlooked . . . and which may perhaps cast doubt on the claim of either Q to the parentage of the F text; *for it can hardly be supposed that both were made use of in preparing it for the printers*. I give some half-dozen instances and must then leave this question to the judgment of the reader.'⁴ Daniel's half-dozen instances, which ought to have been sufficient in themselves to invalidate his assumption, are worth quoting in full:

1. I. iv. 4. 'For which I *raiz'd* my likeness,' F1. Q2 has *raizd*; Q1 more correctly *raz'd*.
2. II. i. 120. 'Occasions Noble Gloster of some *prize*,' F1. So also Q2; the uncorrected sheet of Q1 has *prise*, the corrected sheet *poysse*, and this is the reading chosen by most editors. . . .
3. II. ii. 58, 62. The F in both these places hyphens *gray-beard*; so also does Q2. Both are wrong of course. Q1 is only partially wrong; it gives the hyphen in the first place, but omits it in the second.
4. II. ii. 77. 'Smoile you my speeches,' F1. So also Q2. Q1, which has here a wrong arrangement of lines, gives the word as *smoyle*. . . . It may be noted that in the next line F agrees with Q2 in reading *if* for the *and* of Q1.

¹ p. 21.

² Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles (1885), *Lear*, Q1.

³ But see below, p. 256.

⁴ Daniel, loc. cit., pp. xx-xxi (italics mine).

5. II. iii. 4. The F misprints *vnusall*; so also does Q2.

6. v. iii. 121, 122—

'Know thy name is lost

By Treasons tooth: bare-gnawne, and canker-bit,' F1.

The Qq make one line of *know . . . tooth*, Q1 ending it with a period, Q2 with a colon. The latter would seem to be responsible for the mis-punctuation of the F.

This list, Daniel adds, correctly, might be lengthened.

It will be noticed that all six readings (seven including *and/if*) are errors; and all (except *if*) are rejected by the (Old) Cambridge editors. Such an agreement in error of F and an intermediate quarto is beyond the reach of coincidence, and ought to have been a danger signal to Daniel. The evidence, of which this is but a part, speaks for itself. Yet, to my knowledge, no editor or critic since Daniel so much as refers to it. Why? Because it is an inconvenient hypothesis, and tends to be passed over. The assumption with which it conflicts is that *Lear* is a Good, or on recent theories a 'doubtful', quarto; that is, it originated with Shakespeare's Company, as a prompt-book put together, say, in the provinces, or on some similar occasion when the regular prompt-book was not available.¹ The Company would thus have no objection, so the assumption goes, to bringing a quarto of this kind into conformity with their existing manuscript, if indeed they did not use the quarto itself (thus altered) as a prompt-book. The copy-quarto was therefore altered by, or with the authority of, Heminge and Condell. Daniel, although he thought the quarto 'stolne and surreptitious',² as he did that of *Richard III*, made the same assumption, and speaks of 'the scribe employed by Messrs. Heminge and Condell' to enlarge, alter, and correct a copy of the quarto of that play 'in accordance with a complete MS. of the play in the possession of the theatre'.³ In both cases, the prime assumption is the correction of *one* quarto. When, therefore, *two* quartos threatened to destroy the whole hypothesis, one had to be discarded.

Even if Daniel was not aware of it, however, we are: that printers did, in fact, use more than one quarto edition even in setting up another. Greg, who accepts Daniel's main hypothesis on Q copy, has himself proved this with regard to the printing of Q5 of *Richard III* from Q3 and Q4.⁴ The logical thing, in any case, is not to ignore the facts that conflict with the hypothesis, but to accept the facts and alter the hypothesis.

The presence of two quartos as copy for F *Lear*, of which Daniel gives sufficient evidence, may be corroborated by detailed collation. Here one

¹ Greg, *op. cit.* (on the analogy of Patrick, *Richard III* (Stanford, 1936)); followed by Duthie, *King Lear* (Oxford, 1949).

³ Daniel, *Richard III* Q1, v-vi.

² *Op. cit.*, xvi-xvii.

⁴ *Library*, xvii (1936-7), 88-97.

must, of course, allow for the known spelling preferences of compositor B, who was responsible for the Folio text; for the compositor of Q2—also probably B, as suggested by Williams;¹ for the derivation of F and Q2 from the corrected or uncorrected formes of Q1 where Q1 provided the copy or basis for them; and for the amendment from the manuscript of the Q copy, which might bring F into agreement with Q1 even where it was derived from Q2 copy. When these and any other relevant factors have been discounted, it is still obvious that F followed now one, now the other quarto. The agreements run in sequences, which are mutually exclusive, and coincide, as we should expect, with the pages of one quarto or the other. On signature I4 (of Q2; K1^r of Q1), for example, there occur at least a dozen agreements of F with Q2 against Q1, including *pezant* (Q1 *pesant* iv. vi. 233²), *darst*/*Dar'st* (Q1 *durst* 234), and *chill* (Q1 *ile* 243). Again, on D4 of Q2, we have such agreements as *stockes*;/*Stocks*; (Q1 *stockes*? II. ii. 128); *Lord, away*. (Q1 *Lord away* 146); and *beast*; (Q1 *beast* II. iii. 9).

A further interesting piece of corroboration occurs at II. iii. 16, where the Q1F agreement *wodden* (Q2 *wooden*) appears on the same Q1 page as Daniel's example of a common Q2F misprint, *vnusall*, II. iii. 4. This might seem, and perhaps seemed to Daniel, to rule out any possibility of a two-quarto copy theory. On the contrary, it makes it all the more certain. For one has only to turn to the passage in Q2, and, as one could have predicted, the page-division there occurs *between* the two readings, at II. iii. 10–11. The F compositor, therefore, completed, at that point, the Q2 page, and returned to the use of Q1 copy.

Similarly, it is significant that the F compositor, in the same context, follows his copy in the alternative spellings *loynes*/*loines*—the Q2 *loines* at II. iii. 10, but the Q1 *loynes* at II. iv. 9, that is, on the pages corresponding to the Q2 and Q1 misprints above.

The case may be further tested by taking any of the Q pages on which Daniel's other Q2F readings occur. In the first,³ at I. iv. 4 (Q2 *raizd*; F *raiz'd*; Q1 *raz'd*), there are no exclusive Q1F readings, but the following from Q2F:

I. iv. 4	Q1	thar't	Q2F	thou art
31		<i>om.</i>		thou
42		dinner, ho		dinner ho,
45		you,		you—
47		foole, ho		foole? Ho, (Q2 ho,)

The same phenomenon may be found on all the other pages concerned.

¹ *Shakespeare Quarterly*, iv (1953), 451–60.

² References as in the Cambridge edition, 1892.

³ Q1, I. iv. 2–46; Q2, I. iii. 15–1. iv. 33.

And it is particularly significant that three major examples should occur together on one page (E1^v of Q1; D3^r of Q2)—namely *gray-beard* (II. ii. 62), *Smoile* (II. ii. 77), and *if* (for *and* II. ii. 78).

The consistent effect of the evidence, then, and of further detailed collation of the texts, is to show that there is a strong presumption that corrected Q2 copy was used for F on (at least) the following signatures: B4; C1^v; C2^v; D4; E1^v–E3^v; E4^v; F1^r–F2^v; G1^r; I3^r; K1^r; K2; K4^r; L1^v; L2^v.¹ On these pages, evidence of Q2 copy is, of course, accompanied by absence of Q1 copy. A certain amount of overlapping may be expected where the signatures of the two quartos overlap. The exact extent of the use of each quarto remains to be worked out; but it would seem as if the principle of alternation of pages or of series of pages had been adopted at some points.

It might be argued, as against this interpretation of the evidence, that since Q2, like F, was probably set up by compositor B, F coincidences with Q2 (as opposed to Q1) are due to B's common errors or deviations from Q1. We should at least have to discount B's presence as a common factor. The answer is that if B is present throughout both Q2 and F, these coincidences should also be found indiscriminately throughout the text. But, as we have seen, there is a distinct cleavage between the stints of Q1 and Q2 copy in F, where enough variants occur to enable the particular Q copy to be distinguished.

It remains to notice an important article by Dr. Philip Williams,² which would deny the theory of corrected quarto copy for F *Lear*. Williams begins from the general thesis that a heavily corrected quarto would make poor printer's copy; that correction would be impracticable on certain Q pages because of lack of space; and that 'it would be more difficult to collate and annotate some pages of the *Lear* quarto than it would be to transcribe directly from the manuscript that was being used for reference'.³ He then leads as evidence various groups of anomalies in spelling, spacing of stage-directions, and use of italics, to argue (a) that the F text was not set up entirely by compositor B; and (b) that, where B was the compositor, he set from manuscript, not from a corrected quarto.

This is not the place to examine Williams's theory in detail. I think, however, that he fails to make his case on either count. His evidence, much of which is striking, is based on too narrow a range of B's work, is often inconclusive, and in places cancels itself out. This may be illustrated by the examination of one of his main points, where my suggestion that Q2 was used as F copy has a bearing. Williams lists all the F instances of four proper names, as samples: Gloster, Kent, Albany, Tom—and shows that in certain passages (which he agrees were set up by B) they are printed

¹ Pages as in Q1.

² See p. 255, n. 1.

³ Loc. cit., pp. 456–7.

in roman instead of the italic used elsewhere in the F text. Since these examples are printed in italic in Q₁—B's alleged copy—the change must be due, he argues, to a change in the copy from print to manuscript of some sort.

Now Williams asserts—and he is probably right—that Q₂ was set up (from Q₁) by the same compositor, B. And, leaving aside the chance, which he does not mention, that B setting from print might act rather differently from B setting from manuscript or corrected quarto, this admission can be used as a double weapon against the very case he is trying to establish. For, in Q₂, B can be shown to do just what he is assumed not to do when setting from print in F—turn some of the italic of his copy into roman. Of the thirty-two F instances of roman quoted as evidence, thirty are in italic in Q₁, one is already in roman there, and one does not occur. But—and this is the crucial point—seven out of the thirty are already in roman in Q₂. So that B, even in setting up Q₂ from the print of Q₁, has already shown a strong tendency to change italic to roman in the selected proper names, and the fact that he gives further scope to the tendency in F becomes natural, instead of anomalous. Further, the majority of the seven Q₂ examples occur where I have suggested that Q₂ was used as copy for F. On a wider basis, which is advisable in dealing with such indefinite material as compositors' spelling habits, Williams could have found B using roman for proper names in any of his stints in the history plays, for example. In F 1 *Henry IV*, B regularly substituted roman for the Q italic of such names as Westmerland, Stafford, Northumberland, March, Worcester, and sometimes even Iacke (e.g. v. iii. 103). What is obviously needed is a much more comprehensive study of B's habits, differentiated according as he is working from print, manuscript, or corrected quarto, and perhaps according as he is working alone or in alternation with A. The same criticisms apply to B's spelling preferences, where Williams's case is even less well founded.

It may be added, with reference to the general objection to the practicality of using the corrected Q method of setting up the F text, that there would in fact have been very little difficulty in the case of *Lear*, and especially at those points where Williams admits B as the compositor.¹ Almost all the alterations here were deletions. For example, on (Q₁) G₃^v, three lines would have to be inserted, but ten to be deleted. A slip of paper containing the three, pasted over the gap left by the ten (if there was no room elsewhere on the Q page), seems the natural and easy solution. The same situation arises on H₂. It would seem superfluous to transcribe such pages. And these are representative of this part of the play. Some earlier pages might require an additional slip to carry matter absent from

¹ Q₁ signatures G₁^v (III. iv. 11) to the end.

Q and therefore to be inserted; but this would offer an infinitely quicker and handier method of preparing the copy than would wholesale transcription. And with *two* quartos available, the editor in the printing-house could allow himself greater freedom, and a little scissors-and-paste might go a long way.

For there seems to be no reasonable doubt that *both* quartos of *Lear*, after correction from an authoritative manuscript, were in fact used as copy, or basis, for F.¹ And this practice points rather to the printing-house than to the theatre, and to the Bad rather than the 'doubtful' status of the quarto text. For it is unthinkable that the Company would resort to such a device as the use of *two* quartos alternately as prompt-books. Nor is it probable that if a transcription of Q, with manuscript corrections, was to be undertaken, a two-quarto method could or would have been used; the difficulty of two men trying simultaneously to transcribe one manuscript is obvious enough. On the other hand, the alternate use of two quartos for correction is just the sort of device likely to suit the collaboration of editor and compositor—the editor correcting in advance on one quarto, and handing it to the compositor while he proceeded to correct the other. A further advantage might be that if the Q text required insertions or rearrangement, as by cutting up a Q page, the text on the other side was still available in the other quarto, and much greater freedom could be used. One can only speculate as to the actual procedure, but that some such method would work, and work economically, can be tested, and works.

It may further be inferred that since the alleged derivation of the quarto from the theatre (as in the case of *Richard III*) is the only real ground, apart from its superiority as a report over some of the Bad quartos, for describing *Lear* as a 'doubtful' quarto, it may be worth reconsidering its real nature. I suggest that it is in fact Bad, and only a degree better than, for example, *The True Tragedy* or the first quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*. But that is another question.

¹ Since this went to press, I have found on re-reading Professor Madeleine Doran's *The Text of 'King Lear'* (Stanford, 1931), pp. 110–21, that she had observed the Q2F agreements. She was puzzled by them, but did suggest F reference to, and even occasional printing from, Q2. Dr. Alice Walker, who also had her suspicions, kindly sent me the further evidence of Q2F brackets (II. i. 84; II. iv. 246; IV. vii. 38, 68, 74; V. iii. 184–6), dash (I. iv. 45, 348; II. iv. 279), and period (I. iv. 313) for aposiopesis, stage-directions (e.g. I. ii. 168), and omissions (II. ii. 146; IV. vi. 269).

AN EARLY PRINTED REPORT ON THE APPARITION OF MRS. VEAL

By ARTHUR H. SCOUTEN

‘IN the history of Defoe studies’, writes Professor James Sutherland, ‘two things have constantly been happening: what has long seemed to be unquestionable fact has been shown to be pure invention, and stories which have appeared to be undoubtedly fictions of Defoe’s have turned out to be perfectly true.’¹ A recent discovery reveals that not only was Mrs. Bargrave’s story widely circulated in London and Canterbury during the autumn of 1705, but it had also appeared in a London newspaper six months before the publication of Defoe’s famous pamphlet.

The traditional account of the origin of *A True Relation of the Apparition of one Mrs. Veal* is that Defoe composed it to promote the sale of Drelincourt’s *The Christian’s Defense against the Fears of Death*. Who but Defoe, wrote Sir Walter Scott, ‘would have thought of summoning up a ghost from the grave to bear witness in favour of a halting body of divinity?’² In 1895, however, George Aitken upset tradition and theory by presenting documentary evidence to show that the persons named in Defoe’s *A True Relation* actually existed, and by finding an issue of that pamphlet with manuscript notes recording an interview with Mrs. Bargrave on 21 May 1714.³ His conclusion was that ‘Defoe invented nothing, or next to nothing, but simply told, very skilfully, a ghost story which was attracting notice at the time’.⁴ This verdict was confirmed by Sir Charles Firth in this journal in 1931.⁵ He printed Lucy Lukyn’s letter about Mrs. Bargrave’s story, dated 9 October 1705, and concluded of Defoe and his pamphlet, ‘Probably he had more than one version of it at his disposal’.

Lately another version of Mrs. Bargrave’s seance has received attention. It was found by Rodney M. Baine and printed in June 1954.⁶ This account, though not published until 1766, was written by a Rev. Mr. Payne and (according to the publisher) is based on an interview with Mrs. Bargrave in 1722. Payne agrees in certain details with the then unpublished letter of Lucy Lukyn, and, though drawing upon Defoe, he undoubtedly had access to fresh and reliable sources of information.

¹ Defoe (London, 1937), p. 9.

² *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (Edinburgh, 1834), iv. 268.

³ First published in *The Nineteenth Century*, xxxviii (1895), 95–100, and later in his edition of Defoe’s *Romances and Narratives*, xv. xiv–xxii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

⁵ *R.E.S.*, vii (1931), 1–6.

⁶ ‘The Apparition of Mrs. Veal: A Neglected Account’, *P.M.L.A.*, lxix (1954), 523–41.

Some time ago my colleague Emmett L. Avery noticed the advertisement in a Pickering and Chatto catalogue of an early London newspaper, *The Loyal Post: with Foreign and Inland Intelligence*, printed thrice a week by Sam Bridge from 23 November 1705 until 29 March 1706, fifty-five numbers in all. Only one number of this periodical had been previously noticed. The Crane and Kaye *Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals* (item 1549) and the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* (ii. 707) list only the first number. The run was purchased by the New York Public Library on 24 November 1952 and deposited in the Reserve Room, though it was not catalogued as late as August 1954. On the last day of August I examined this newspaper carefully for any theatrical advertisements it might carry or any reference to actors, dramatists, or theatres.

The Loyal Post was printed on both sides of a single folio sheet. It carried foreign and domestic news, and the verso was largely filled with advertisements of alleged medicinal cures. In Number 14, printed Monday 24 December 1705, the following report appeared:

There are many Persons in Town that have Letters giving an account of a remarkable Passage that happned lately in the City of Canterbury, Several Letters thereof from Persons of Good Credit have reached our hands, besides Relations we have had by Word of Mouth; and therefore it being better attested than things of this Nature generally are, we hope it will not be unacceptable, there being no room left for Scruple or Caption.

There were 2 Persons, intimate Acquaintance, one call'd Mrs Bargrove, The Wife of an Attorney near St. George's Gate in the City of Canterbury, and the other Mrs. Veal, who lately lived at Dover, where Mrs. Bargrove lived formerly, and contracted their Familiarity. Mrs Veal had been about the beginning of September last at Canterbury, and paid a Visit to Mrs. Bargrove, and went well from her, but happened to dye Suddenly on Friday the 7th of September last. Mrs. Bargrove knowing nothing of her death, sat at work in her House on Saturday the 8th about 12 of the Clock at noon, and hearing a little Noise at the Door, Rose and opened it, and immediately Mrs. Veal, her Friend, rushed by her into the House, attired in such a Dress as she usually wore; in a Coulored Riding Gown wrapt about her, a Yellow Gause Handkerchief about her Neck, a Night-dress on her Head with Scarlet bridle-strings. Mrs. Bargrove and she had a Discourse for two hours on various Subjects: She asked her to eat, but she refused: But told her she was going a great Journey, and she says, that to her thinking she took up a Book, and told her, that they two had passed away many Hours with that Good Book. She enquired likewise if her Husband was kinder then he used Exhorting her to bear all things as well as she could, for it would not be long Ere she should be delivered out of all her troubles. She informed her of several private Matters, bidding Mrs. Bargrove write them down, to which Mrs. Bargrove repli'd, 'twas better for her self to do it; the seeming Mrs Veal returned Answer, but do you Mall (the name of Familiarity she formerly used.) Some of the Matters were Secrets that none but 2 Persons knew of, who say, that they are confi-

dent, Mrs. Bargrove did not know that Matter in Mrs. Veals Life-time. There are abundance of Particulars of the two hour [something inked in over the *r*] Discourse which Mrs. Bargrove relates too tedious here to [the *t* is inked] be inserted: Some concerning her seeming Gown she had on, which she told Mrs. Bargrove that Mr. Watsons Daughter helpt make, which since, upon Inquiry, she found to be true.

She asked likewise how her little God-Daughter did? Mrs Bargrove answered she was well but was at such a Place; And would send for her, but going out of Doors to get her called, at her return she sees her Friend Mrs Veal, going out of her House, and followed her in the Street, and called after her to have her come back, but she refused, saying, she was going to her Cosin Captain Watson's: Mrs Bargrove thinking she had been then going to the Wells, as she used to do every Year, took her leave for that time of Mrs Veal (as she thought) telling her, that she would come and take her Leave again the next Day at Captain Watson's: And says, that she saw her turn the Corner at the Town Dike, and left following her, returned to her House, suspecting nothing of her being Dead: But her Husband coming home at Night, in the midst of some Angry Words, told her, now her Friend Mrs Veal was Dead; She did not believe him, thinking he had said it to vex her, and the next Day told him, that she saw Mrs Veal Yesterday, to which he replied, that then it was the Devil, for Mrs Veal was surely Dead. Upon which Confidence of his, Mrs Bargrove being surprised, went to Captain Watson's, where Mrs Veal said she was going, to enquire for her, they told her, that she had not been there, but they heard she had been Ill on Fryday, supposing it was only her usual Illness, which was Fits: And Mrs Bargrove describing her dress, and what she said of the Gown, they confirmed the truth of, that Mr Watson's Daughter did help make it. This put Mrs Bargrove into a great Surprize; And on the Enquiry found she did really dye on Fryday toward Night. Both Mrs Bargrove and the Deceased were Persons of Reputation, and Many Judicious Persons have taken the Pains to inform themselves particularly of the Matter. More especially, Mr Paris the Minister of St Andrews. Dr Boyce and other Eminent Persons, both Clergy and Layety: To all whom Mrs Bargrove gives the same Relation, not varying in a Tittle.

There are a few matters concerning this version that should be mentioned. First, its place in the chronology of the early versions can be set forth: on Monday 10 September 1705 Mrs. Veal was buried at Dover; on Tuesday 9 October Miss Lukyn wrote an account of Mrs. Bargrave's seance to her aunt; on Monday 24 December a version was printed in *The Loyal Post*; and on Friday 5 July 1706 Defoe's *True Relation* was published.

Defoe may or may not have seen this fourteenth number of *The Loyal Post*. The parallels are slight. Mrs. Veal is going to her Cousin Watson in both, whereas the Lukyn letter gives Uncle Watson. Defoe and *The Loyal Post* both stress Mrs. Veal's comforting Mrs. Bargrave under her afflictions, a matter on which Lucy Lukyn is silent. Both the newspaper and Defoe have a good deal to say about Mrs. Veal's gown, whereas no details are

given by the Lukyn letter. (The full details about the gown in *The Loyal Post* are supported best by Payne's account.) Both Defoe and the newspaper differ slightly from the other accounts by the repetition of the hour as twelve o'clock at noon. Otherwise the differences are greater than the similarities.

One parallel with the Lukyn letter is significant, and suggests that the editor of *The Loyal Post* may have seen a redaction of it: he agrees with Miss Lukyn in writing *Bargrove*, a form found in no other known account or contemporary reference. The above text also agrees with the Lukyn letter in that Mrs. Bargrave relates that Mrs. Veal 'rushed by her', as opposed to Defoe's emphasis on the evasion of physical contact at the proffered salutation. But *The Loyal Post* article differs sharply from the Lukyn letter in omitting the Hazlewood reference and in making the unique assertion that Mr. Bargrave was the first person who knew of Mrs. Veal's death.

More significant than these parallels or variations is the evidence which *The Loyal Post* version gives of Defoe's methods in arranging the story for the printer. On the basis of the statements by the publisher T. Luckman and by Payne, Dr. Baine proposes to return to an estimate like that of Sir Walter Scott. Payne writes that 'One thing [that] has much contributed to sink the credit of the story' is 'its being published in a new edition of Drelincourt's . . . by the accident of that book's falling into the subject of conversation, and being preferred by Mrs. Veal'.¹ Hence Payne concludes by calling Defoe's version 'a trading story'. In discussing Payne's view, Dr. Baine observes that the first edition of Defoe's pamphlet adds an advertisement of Drelincourt's book. He quotes this advertisement in full and then goes on to say,

Characteristically enough with all this puffing, Defoe made Mrs. Veal, as the authority on supernatural matters, the first to mention each book which is discussed. In the more natural Payne version Mrs. Bargrave is the first to mention each; and the other accounts, particularly the Spavan report, point to the probability that this must have been the way in which Mrs. Bargrave recounted her story. It is this sort of emphasis, Payne evidently thought, which led many to regard Defoe's narrative as a 'trading story'. Comparison of the various reports on this particular gives additional support to a view once popular—that Defoe published his narrative partly as an advertising scheme.²

In fact, the manuscript notes based on the 1714 interview with Mrs. Bargrave bear testimony on this point: from the interviewer's notes George Aitken writes, 'Among the devotional works recommended by Mrs. Veal he mentions Scott's *Christian Life*'. Now, with an account printed before

¹ 'The Apparition of Mrs. Veal: A Neglected Account', *P.M.L.A.*, lxix (1954), 531.

² *Ibid.*, p. 537.

Defoe's, we have new evidence; *The Loyal Post* informs us that it was Mrs. Veal who introduced the subject of 'that Good Book'. Comparison of the phrasing here with that in Spavan's account is instructive. Spavan's text (prefixed to the 1720 edition of Drelincourt) reads, 'here's a Book you and I have often read together';¹ but he attributes the statement to Mrs. Bargrave instead of to Mrs. Veal. It is not necessary to consider whether Defoe knew *The Loyal Post* account; what its discovery at present means is that there was a printed version before Defoe's narrative and that one of its sources must have credited Mrs. Veal with introducing the subject of a religious book.

¹ Quoted by Baine, loc. cit.

'MARK RUTHERFORD' AND HERO-WORSHIP

(Comments on 'Browning and "Mark Rutherford"', by Wilfred H. Stone,
R.E.S., N.S. iv (1953), 249-59)

By ROSEMARY BERESFORD

SOME hitherto unpublished letters and notes by Browning and William Hale White are the subject of Mr. Stone's article which appeared in this journal in July 1953. While Mr. Stone must be congratulated on having traced these letters, it is to be regretted that he should have cast upon his 'finds' an interpretation which seems less than fair to Hale White. It is the purpose of this present article to examine Mr. Stone's interpretation of the evidence he calls and then to put forward some alternative suggestions.

Mr. Stone's main contention is that Hale White's relationship with Browning is an illustration of Hale White's tendency to confuse pursuit of the 'best' with pursuit of the 'best' men, and of his incapacity to sustain a satisfactory relationship with those thus pursued.

There is no doubt that Hale White had a capacity for hero-worship in the sense that he greatly admired and revered those men and women—whether they were living or dead—whose writings had most deeply influenced his own development and thought. More will be said of this later. But it is one thing to acknowledge this; it is quite another to maintain, as Mr. Stone does, that Hale White did not distinguish in his own life between idolatry and the philosophic search for truth:

His 'longing for continuous intercourse with the best' was not simply a longing for perfection in virtue and knowledge; it was also a deep craving to be on intimate terms with the 'best' men, especially with those poets and writers who claimed to have discovered some order beneath the apparent spiritual anarchy of the nineteenth century. He longed to know these great men as he had once known God; in a very real sense they were his substitute for God. But Hale White himself was morbidly shy, insecure, self-absorbed, and these qualities, while perhaps inspiring the proper humility before one's Maker, did not make for ease or grace in human relationships. In the course of his life he became personally acquainted with Browning, Carlyle, George Eliot, Emerson, Mazzini, Maurice, Ruskin, Swinburne, Watts-Dunton, Morris, and others, but with none of them did he maintain a close or lasting relationship. . . . He remained a hero-worshipper throughout his life, but when the distance between himself and his heroes narrowed to something like intimacy, he always ran away; the sight of their confidence and worldly success only intensified his own sense of failure, and the necessity of maintaining manly dignity in their presence instead of throwing

himself at their feet only served as a tormenting reminder that these surrogate gods were no substitute for the real thing.¹

The list given by Mr. Stone of writers whose acquaintance Hale White sought or made but did not cultivate is basic to his argument, but the question must be asked whether these names can be fairly bracketed together. Four of the people mentioned, for example, were very much senior to Hale White in age. He was born in 1831. Carlyle was thirty-six years older, Emerson twenty-eight, and F. D. Maurice and Mazzini twenty-six. It can be held that the nature of his association with them was consonant with this difference in age as well as with some difference in social position. As a young man he met Carlyle once, being taken to see him by his father who was door-keeper of the House of Commons: 'It was through one of the Russells, with whom my father was acquainted, that I was permitted with him to call on Carlyle, an event amongst the greatest in my life, and all the happier for me because I did not ask to go.'² Similarly, in either 1848 or 1872 (the two dates when Emerson visited England) he spent one morning in Emerson's company,³ and he was invited to breakfast with F. D. Maurice in consequence of a pamphlet written and sent to Maurice by his father protesting at his son's expulsion from a theological college for doubting the infallibility of the Bible.⁴ He visited Mazzini once in the 1860's; this occasion is probably commemorated most fully in his novel *Clara Hopgood*, when Clara goes to see Mazzini and is sent by him to help to liberate Italy. Hale White's personal account given to a friend in 1899 runs:

I spent one evening almost alone with Mazzini. He was living then under a feigned name in very humble lodgings in Brompton. He had much of the saint in him, and consequently it was difficult, for me at least, completely to sympathize with him. Imperfection of sympathy, however, did not prevent an admiration, almost enthusiastic, for him, especially for his sublime courage and for his faith in certain Ideals to which he gave the name of God. In his purity and simplicity of worship he was altogether un-English, admitting no compromises, a true believer in the celestial Kingdom of the New Testament. He was not a failure, although Italy is not yet a regenerate republic. Such as he are the salt of the earth, and the more impracticable they are, the more do they sweeten and preserve it.⁵

Ruskin, although only twelve years older than Hale White, established his reputation at a very early age and by virtue of this, together with the

¹ *R.E.S.*, N.S. iv (1953), 249-50.

² W. Hale White, *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford* (Oxford, 1913), p. 35.

³ D. V. White, *The Groombridge Diary* (Oxford, 1924), p. 301.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 71; see also *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford*, p. 72.

⁵ *Letters to Three Friends* (Oxford, 1924), p. 193; see also p. 379.

differences in their social circumstances, was always regarded by Hale White as very much his senior. Initially Ruskin took an interest in the 1850's in Hale White's brother, who had shown promise as a painter but died young, and had advised the father on his training.¹ He apparently extended this to, or exchanged it for, a benign but distant interest in Hale White himself which was maintained over forty years. In 1867 he was responsible for recommending to him as an architect Philip Webb, who became a close friend of Hale White's.² Years later, in 1891, Hale White reports to a correspondent, 'I had a message from Ruskin a few days ago. He is placid and happy, but never puts his hand to paper, not even to write a note.'³

Swinburne, Watts-Dunton, and Morris were all contemporaries of Hale White's, but he did not meet Swinburne till 1899, when Swinburne was 'unhappily so deaf that it is difficult to keep up a conversation with him'.⁴ As young men their respective social positions would have rendered meeting, let alone friendship, most surprising. Watts-Dunton is presumably only included in this list because anyone who met Swinburne after 1879 inevitably met him. William Morris dined once with Hale White in 1884;⁵ the link between them was probably Philip Webb. In so far as Hale White was a strong supporter of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and was in general sympathy with the 'progressive' movements in art, literature and politics of his period, he respected Morris but he was not an ardent admirer of his writings.⁶

Of those so far discussed, it will be seen that the circumstances in which Hale White met them rendered the development of a close relationship with any of them very unlikely. There is no evidence that he sought or half-desired this, or had any motives, where he was responsible for initiating the meeting, different from those which prompt literary men in this century, as in the last, to write to other literary men more distinguished than themselves whose writings they admire. If Bertrand Russell, T. S. Eliot, and Herbert Read—to take three names at random—should have kept records of all the sessions they have devoted to discussing with intelligent strangers topics of common interest to both, the total would almost certainly be found to be very high. Most of such strangers could probably be convicted of a modest element of exhibitionism, as Hale White probably can, but the degree in which it is present is so slight as to make it hardly worth remarking on.

Apart from Browning, then, there remains only George Eliot to consider; and here it is true that Hale White was offered some opportunity of friendship

¹ *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford*, pp. 5-9.

² *Letters to Three Friends*, pp. 52-53.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁴ *Groombridge Diary*, p. 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 155.

with her, did not take advantage of it or make use of the acquaintance when she had grown to fame, and greatly regretted later that he did not. Considering, however, that when he knew her he was a young man of twenty-one and she a woman of thirty-three who had not as yet written her first novel, there is nothing very remarkable about this. Hale White himself never makes it really clear whether, at the period they worked together on the *Westminster Review*, he nourished the passion or experienced the indifference of a very young man for an older woman. Since he was very susceptible and very serious-minded it was probably the former. But whichever it was, when she emerged later as a writer of books that exercised a powerful influence on his own, romantic delicacy or remorse (and possibly a mixture of both) disabled him from making any approaches to her but did not prevent him from wishing that he could—a dilemma of a type that most sensitive people have found themselves in at least once in their lives.

Mr. Stone's general theory depends, then, on somewhat slender support, and the particular illustration of Browning which he devotes most of his space to does not, in my opinion, greatly strengthen his case.

On the face of it, the material Mr. Stone has collected would seem to show that Hale White's interest in Browning, the man, was largely relative: Bunyan was the cause of his first approach to Browning, George Eliot was the cause of his second, and the notes Hale White made of their two meetings are principally a record of what Browning had to say about these two authors, and about Shelley, Carlyle, and Swinburne. On his side, Browning chose to write to congratulate Hale White on an article of his about Byron in the *Contemporary Review*. It was an association born of particular occasions. Mr. Stone, however, considers that Hale White's real motive was different from his ostensible purpose. His real motive was that he wished to attract Browning's attention; having done so, he withdrew alarmed; and once Browning was dead and could no longer serve as an earthly god, he criticized his poetry in a way he would never have done when Browning was alive.

To distinguish between the real and the ostensible motives in one's own behaviour is very difficult; it is much more so in the case of other people, particularly those long since dead. Mr. Stone's assertion that 'we can be quite certain' what Hale White's real purpose was is hard to accept. It is all a matter of interpretation, and there are three points notably where Mr. Stone's interpretation of the evidence seems to me to break down.

The first is general and purely negative. Doubtfulness of motive is often reflected in a man's style. Hale White's notes describing his two meetings with Browning no more support in style than they do in content any suggestion of a real motive underlying an ostensible one. They are models of objective reporting; and so far as content is concerned, the author

devotes a few lines in his first set of notes to his reactions to Browning (which were not entirely favourable); he gives no indication of Browning's reactions to him. For one who on Mr. Stone's theory was in the presence of a god, Hale White seems to have kept remarkably detached.

The only instance Mr. Stone is able to offer of a positive indication in style of a double motive is some phrases from a letter of Hale White's quoted by Browning. Browning says, 'You should never talk of "intruding on me" "inflicting your presence" and so forth' and assures him that a visit from him could not possibly be "a trouble"'. Mr. Stone deduces from these phrases that

Hale White was a master at advertising his humility and unworthiness in such a way that the person hearing his words had no choice but to protest the opposite. It was the device of a Puritan at prayer, but in this case of one who was reduced to seeking his gods on this earth.¹

Mr. Stone surely takes too little account here of the manners and proprieties of the period. Hale White had met Browning once two years previously; it was no more than etiquette that he should express some formal hesitancy in making use of so slight a previous acquaintance.²

The second point concerns Mr. Stone's treatment of dates. On the straightforward interpretation that Hale White's association with Browning was one born of particular occasions, there is no difficulty about these. Effectively, such association as there was lapsed after 1881. But in 1889, when the Browning-Fitzgerald controversy broke out, Hale White thought it proper to show which side he was on. He held love between the sexes in romantically high regard himself and it is consistent with his general attitude and temperament that he should have sympathized strongly with the feelings of any man who found himself in Browning's situation.

Mr. Stone's theory, however, requires that some explanation must be sought for the gap between 1881 and 1889. Why did the relationship 'languish' for nearly nine years? He finds that

It is perhaps significant that the period from, roughly, 1881-1889 was for Hale White a period of almost unrelieved melancholy and emotional depression. It was in those years that he most seriously tried to find some serenity by telling himself that 'continuous intercourse with the best' was beyond his strength, and a logical result of that mood might very well be the conviction that to thrust himself again upon Browning's attention would be shameful and vulgar.³

¹ *R.E.S.*, loc. cit., pp. 252-3.

² To a modern ear, Browning's phrasing of his first invitation to Hale White to lunch after he had been given a portrait of Bunyan may sound somewhat excessive: 'If you have, by good chance, any occasion to come our way, and may be induced to apprise me by a written word, that gratification will complete whatever seems wanting from this present one—great as it is.'

³ Loc. cit., p. 255.

Hale White was subject throughout his life to fits of melancholic depression and was not exempt from them between 1881 and 1889. They can scarcely, however, have been 'unrelieved'. Mr. Stone omits to mention that this full-time Admiralty Civil Servant who had been promoted Assistant Director of Contracts in 1879 produced three novels during this period and put through the press a translation of Spinoza's *Ethica*. A fourth novel was published in 1890. His correspondence with his friend Mrs. Colenutt shows him leading an active intellectual and not unsocial life which included having Morris to dinner in 1884. What grounds Mr. Stone has for saying that these were the years during which Hale White most seriously tried to find some serenity, I do not know. It is true that he wrote *Deliverance* then, including the passage that Mr. Stone quotes, but it cannot be assumed that *Deliverance*, in so far as it is partly autobiographical, reflects the phases through which the man of fifty-three who wrote it was then passing. It is more likely that he was looking back to the experiences of his thirties: the Mark Rutherford of *Deliverance* does not reach middle age.

Lastly, there is Mr. Stone's charge of apostasy to consider. In Mr. Stone's view, Hale White disingenuously changed his front after Browning died and this change of front makes their relationship typical of 'the spectacle of Victorian hero-worshipping'.¹ But what was this change of front? Hale White's notes on 15 May 1879 after his first interview show that he did not find Browning, as he was in his later middle age, fundamentally congenial for the very reasons for which he criticizes his works in 1903. In 1879 he writes:

He was extremely cordial and unreserved but yet his cordiality and frankness covered a deeper reserve for he was altogether *objective* in his conversation never once showing a trace of anything more than the cultivated man of the world with literary refined tastes.²

In 1903 he expresses hostility to the literary theory which is 'derived, I believe, from Browning', that 'in conversation and writing a person's real self should be concealed'.³ Consistency could scarcely go further.

Moreover, this particular criticism of Browning the man and Browning the writer should be taken in conjunction with the list of works which Hale White mentions critically in 1899. These are *Inn Album*, *Pachiarotto*, *Parleyings*, *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*—the later Browning, in fact. For the earlier Browning—for works which present-day opinion would consider among his best—he had quite different feelings. *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford*, published in 1913 but written a few years previously, concludes with his reflections on the Victorian Age. The age, he considers, 'was distinguished by an enthusiasm which can only be compared to a religious

¹ Loc. cit., p. 258.

² Ibid., p. 251.

³ Ibid., pp. 258-9.

revival'.¹ There follows a brief reference to his reactions to *Maud* and a lyrical description of his first reading of *Pippa Passes*, which ends, 'The vision still lives'. Then:

If it is true that the Victorian time was ugly and vulgar, it was the time of the *Virginians*, of *David Copperfield*, of Tennyson's *Poems*, of Cromwell's *Letters and Speeches*, of the *Letters and Life of Lord Bacon*, of Emerson's *Essays*, of *Festus*, of the *Dramatis Personae*, and of the *Apologia*. . . The excitement of those years between 1848 and 1890 was, as I have said, something like that of a religious revival, but it was reasonable.²

This is the man about whom Mr. Stone's last sentence runs:

But Browning's voice of happy confidence must have puzzled and then distressed him, like the sound of laughter at a funeral.³

I conclude with some observations on the connexion Mr. Stone traces between two features in Hale White's life: his loss of faith and his capacity for veneration. He conceives Hale White as suffering that sense of terrible deprivation which Tennyson, Arnold, and Clough have so poignantly described, and desperately seeking a substitute in hero-worship. This thesis does not, I think, take sufficient account of the following considerations.

First, loss of his childhood's faith was followed immediately for Hale White by severe economic consequences. In his search for work after he had been expelled from his theological college he saw London's poor, both manual and clerical, at close quarters and experienced at first hand some of the more appalling effects of the Industrial Revolution. It was brought home to him that Britain's social and economic system not only condemned some men to live like beasts but stunted and thwarted potential intelligence in others, and rendered lonely and squalid many office workers' lives. *The Autobiography* and *Deliverance* describe much loneliness and misery, but a good part of that loneliness and misery derives from an economic cause rather than from loss of religious faith.

Secondly, while there is evidence that during the transitional period when he was assailed by 'doubts', Hale White endured much distress of mind, it is much less possible to point to evidence of later regret at what had been lost. Rather the contrary indeed. For one thing there was much that Hale White did not abandon at all. He read the Bible and Bunyan assiduously throughout his life, and he says in *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford* (p. 78):

At first, after the abandonment of orthodoxy, I naturally thought nothing in the old religion worth retaining, but this temper did not last long. Many mistakes may be pardoned in Puritanism in view of the earnestness with which it insists on the distinction between right and wrong.

¹ *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford*, p. 89. ² *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91. ³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 259.

But it was not simply that he held to Christian ethics, he retained strong emotional sympathy with the Christian spiritual experience. The following is a typical expression of his attitude:

I will add that the *New Testament* without the miracles would be ruined, and that no doctrinal statement could convey what they teach. Take, for example, the Temptation in the Wilderness. All the Councils ever assembled could not provide a dogmatic substitute for that divine story.¹

The Bible continued, then, to minister to his emotional religious needs, and Spinoza, it may be hazarded, supplied his philosophical needs. When Hale White first studied Spinoza's works is not certain, but it could not have been later than his very early thirties and was probably before this; and the influence of Spinozism on his six novels is so marked that it is clear that the translation of the *Ethica* was much more to its translator than a pure labour of scholarship. *Clara Hopgood* contains the most direct quotation, but they all carry the Spinozan imprint.

In what has been said, there is no implication that Hale White's abandonment of orthodoxy was not a turning-point in his life; but it may have been more positive than negative in its outcome and it was not, in any event, the only revolutionary experience he encountered during his youth.

With Hale White's loss of faith set in this context, it may appear that his capacity for veneration was exercised towards ends rather different from those that Mr. Stone suggests. Unquestionably he was a man upon whom certain writers exercised great influence. He was drawn to Bunyan not only by identity of faith and birthplace but by a temperamental affinity—an affinity which he felt also with Dr. Johnson. Both Carlyle and Ruskin were great motive forces in affecting the direction of his interests. His first introduction to Wordsworth's poetry stirred him so profoundly that it helped to unsettle his faith. The study of Spinoza enabled him to evolve a philosophy. George Eliot acted as his literary inspiration. For this motley band of authors he had a personal esteem which sprang from gratitude for their works, and these stood in a class apart for him.

In addition, highly responsive as he was to the power of literature, he followed with passionate interest the literary developments of his day, displaying no little acumen and flexibility of mind. The man who read *Maud* with such excitement in the 50's was writing in 1889:

The news of my existence lately has been a play—*A Doll's House*—by Ibsen the Norwegian. . . . It was admirably put on the stage and I have never seen, except from Shakespeare, a play which has a nobler motive or is more dramatic. The godly have screamed at it as immoral, but never mind.²

The geniuses of today may well sigh for more readers like Hale White.

¹ *Groombridge Diary*, p. 3.

² *Letters to Three Friends*, p. 44.

[Mr. Stone writes:

In this brief space I cannot answer Miss Beresford's objections in any detail. For a fuller reply I must refer my critic to my recent book on Hale White where—although I only mention his relationship with Browning—I have taken some pains to describe the peculiar ambivalences of his personality. If I have added up the evidence correctly, it seems to me indisputable that Hale White's yearning for the 'best' had in it a strong admixture of hero-worship. Of course he did not *confuse* pursuit of the 'best' with pursuit of the 'best' men, but his desire to number certain 'greats' among his acquaintance was of a piece with his spiritual and intellectual ambitions. Miss Beresford fails to see, I think, that Hale White's intellectual interests did not exist in isolation from an extremely complicated set of emotional needs. For all his intellectual seriousness and notable achievements, he was a deeply insecure man; he often rejected fame and human love with the same intensity that he sought them. Perhaps in some instances the impediments to closer intimacy with these 'greats' were as Miss Beresford describes them; but with specific information so scarce it is largely her guess against mine. I derived my conclusions from the general *pattern* of his behaviour and from what I have discovered about his personality and its needs. In the case of George Eliot, however, facts are not wanting. She was one of his idols and he had known her personally, yet he failed to maintain the relationship. He attributed his failure to a 'Demon of Pure Malignity'. 'The curse for me', he writes in this connexion, 'has not been plucking forbidden fruit, but the refusal of divine fruit offered me by heavenly angels.'¹ The pattern was repeated in many other passages of his personal life.

Miss Beresford errs slightly in her facts about Emerson and Mazzini and has misquoted me in my remarks about Hale White's melancholy: I did not say it was 'unrelieved', I said it was 'almost unrelieved' between 1881 and 1889. I see no reason to alter this judgement.

Matters relating to the importance of Hale White's apostasy I must leave to the book to answer. But that Hale White was impelled to seek out a body of 'elect' among his contemporaries seems to me clearly written in the record. In general I think Miss Beresford has opened what must, in many respects, remain an open question. But I cannot help feeling that she might not differ so markedly from my interpretations had she consulted the *whole* record and seen Hale White's personality in more perspective.]

¹ 'Confessions of a Self-Tormentor', *More Pages from a Journal* (Oxford, 1910), p. 120.

NOTES

MAX FÖRSTER

8 March 1869–10 November 1954

AN official communiqué from Wasserburg-am-Inn, dated 10 November 1954, brought the news that Professor Max Theodor Wilhelm Förster had died that day, in the eighty-sixth year of his life, after a long illness.

Max Förster is perhaps the last of the great university professors of Germany of the first half of the present century trained in the learning and methodology of the late nineteenth century. The name that comes first to mind from the field of English, as one thinks of him, is that of Eduard Sievers, who was somewhat older. Förster was fortunate in his personal endowment, his training, and his professional career. He early attracted attention, was invited to teach at several universities, and moved from one university to another, enlarging his circle of colleagues, students, and friends, at the same time maintaining a steady and ever-deepening life of scholarship. He exemplifies the best traditions of the university professor: expert in the conduct of academic affairs, an able and stimulating teacher, unusually successful as what in America is called a graduate professor, an alert, energetic, orderly, and gifted scholar, skilful in organizing his findings and preparing them for publication, and, with all that, aware of the life of the world in which he lived, a warm, devoted friend and a delightful companion.

Max Förster was born in Danzig on 8 March 1869. He studied at the universities of Münster (Westphalia), Bonn, and Berlin. His field of interest was philology: comparative grammar and English and the Germanic languages. He was made Doctor of Philosophy at Berlin on 3 December 1892. He volunteered for a year's military service beginning in October 1893. A year later he returned to university life as Reader in the English Language at Bonn; on 16 December 1896 he was officially declared qualified to teach English Language and Literature. In March 1897, barely twenty-eight years of age, he declined an invitation to Jena, and was named *ausserordentlich* Professor at Bonn. On 1 November 1898 he accepted a call to Würzburg, as holder of a newly established chair; in 1902, on declining calls to Cologne and Frankfurt on Main, he was elevated to a regular professorship. On 3 July 1900 he accepted a call to Halle, as successor to Professor Albrecht Wagner, and a year later was called to Leipzig, where he taught for fifteen years. In 1925, then in his mid-fifties,

he went to Munich, where he taught until the spring of 1934, when, owing to political circumstances, he was forced into retirement as Professor Emeritus, and he was denied free access to the English Seminar which he had done much to build up. That summer he was elected corresponding fellow of the British Academy; he had been made a corresponding fellow of the Royal Irish Academy the year before.

In the summer of 1934 he was invited to New Haven as visiting professor at Yale University, where he taught for two years. There he was made an associate fellow of Jonathan Edwards College. He returned to Munich where, thanks to his enforced retirement from academic life, he was able to devote himself to his studies, and could thus write at a prodigious rate and prepare for publication a number of works of great importance, which might never have come to completion had he still been active in the University. He prepared copy and published throughout the war. The bombing of Munich brought his creative life to an end. When his apartment was destroyed he lost a large part of his library. His wife died from illness resulting from the bombing. He was evacuated to Wasserburg and there lived out the last years of his life.

Förster was seventy years of age when World War II broke out. He was in his late seventies, at the war's end, when he was recalled to take part in the re-establishment of academic life at the University of Munich. What this cost him is evident from a letter written in August 1947:

The summer gave me so much work that I really did not know how to get through it. I had (and have) to write out my lecture notes for five hours a week which makes me work up till 11 o'clock every night. I'm giving three courses: 1. History of the English Vowels, 2. History of Early Romantic Literature, and, 3. Chaucer's Prologue. After a pause of 12 years in my teaching imposed upon me by the Nazis, I find that I have forgotten a lot of things which formerly were quite familiar to me. You will notice also that my English has become quite rusty. And there is so much work to be done for the reconstruction of our University. Almost every week we have a faculty meeting of 3-5 hours.

The maintenance of academic duties frequently made it necessary for him to travel between Wasserburg and Munich, usually at difficult hours, and in difficult weather, a heavy drain on the limited physical resources of a man of his years. The welcome appointment of Professor Wolfgang Clemen as his successor permitted final retirement to Wasserburg, where, in advanced old age, and in spite of his failing strength and faculties, he could devote himself to his beloved books.

It is for his scholarship, his sixty years of almost steady publication, that Förster is most widely known. His bibliography as given in *Britannica*, the festschrift honouring his sixtieth birthday in 1929, is extraordinarily impressive; that compiled for his seventieth birthday by Herbert Schöffler

(*Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*, xxxv, 1939) is monumental: it lists 825 separate items, and under a number of these there are subdivisions. The coming years were to show additional works, some of considerable importance. Hundreds of entries in Schöffler's list, it is only fair to add, are reviews and notices of books, some important and many slight. Disregarding these, the original studies form an extraordinarily solid and extensive list, of great variety and importance.

Förster's doctoral study, *Über die Quellen von Ælfric's Homiliae Catholicae*, was significant for the development of the young and gifted candidate. Intimate acquaintance with Thorpe's two volumes gave competence in Old English homiletic literature and led into ecclesiastical literature of the patristic, post-patristic, and Carolingian periods. Homilies, hagiography, apocrypha (largely New Testament) were for him of lively interest. Ælfric's homilies led naturally to the then recently available *Blickling Homilies*, several of which he illuminated with source studies and textual notes. It was natural, when plans were made to bring out a facsimile of Vercelli Codex cxvii, that Förster should have been invited to prepare the introductory matter. This resulted in the first full combination of photoreproduction and scholarship in presenting a complete Anglo-Saxon codex.¹ The German version of the Introduction, published as a monograph in the *Morsbach Festschrift* (1913), was augmented with richly annotated texts of five Vercelli homilies. These beginnings of 1913 were to be the first steps towards a full edition of the Vercelli homilies; unfortunately, World War I, subsequent difficulties in Germany, and the demands on an active university professor combined to delay preparation for the press. A first instalment of some nine texts was printed in 1932, but new factors prevented the appearance of the remainder. Competing demands on his attention in the preparation of introductory matter for the *Exeter Book* (which appeared in 1933), the worry and anxiety caused by his forced retirement from teaching in 1934, and the distraction of his two years at Yale, all kept Förster from completing the Vercelli homilies. In the meantime Henri Grand, the publisher of the *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*, had died, and new arrangements had to be made. Eventually copy went to the new printer, and some proof sheets were sent to Förster. But World War II broke out, and Förster was occupied with *Themse-fluss*, the *Lunarium*, and *Zur Geschichte des Reliquienkultus in Altengland*. When, after the war, it was possible to consider completing the homilies, no trace could be found at the printer's of Förster's manuscript: text, notes, and all had completely disappeared without a trace. Förster was now in his mid-seventies, he had lost many of his books and was without access to an

¹ Zupitza's *Beowulf* was limited to the poem, and did not attempt a full description of the manuscript.

adequate library, and he was living under conditions which made careful work impossible. At length, in 1951, he turned over to the present writer such materials as he then had, and with them Napier's transcripts of the Vercelli homilies.¹

After Förster's published work on the Vercelli manuscript, the *Beowulf* codex, and Cotton Vespasian D XIV, it is not surprising that he was invited to collaborate with R. W. Chambers and Robin Flower in preparing materials for the sumptuous facsimile reproduction of the Exeter Book. Förster contributed three chapters: 'The Donations of Leofric to Exeter', 'The Preliminary matter of the Exeter Book', and 'General Description of the Manuscript'. The last enables one to estimate how much he had grown since 1913: greater precision was demanded and many new questions were being asked of a manuscript. The second chapter illustrates his growing concern with names, place and personal, with local history, and with archaeology. Interest in names had led earlier, in 1923, to the preparation of a trial dictionary of English proper names, and to the increasing attention to names in his various anthologies of English literature; it was to attain free expression in his study of *Thames* as a river name, of which more later.

Förster's chapter on the Leofric donations is a fine monograph in itself: edition of text, variant readings, historical background, manuscript evidence, and rich annotations of the text which combine history, place and personal name studies, hagiography (in note 28 St. Sativola appears in miniature, to be accorded fuller treatment elsewhere), and encyclopaedic utilization of ecclesiological archaeology. Page 27, for instance, shows a single line of basic text across the top of the page; beneath runs a line of variant readings; below them lies the expanse of page, some 7×10 inches of potential printed area, completely occupied by four important interpretative notes. Förster's notes are generous mines of information and guides to sources, a godsend to the inexpert and to those lacking access to a first-class reference library. Förster was highly communicative and longed to share what he had with others. Annotation was such a means, and it was a way of teaching.

Förster's most impulsive, or compulsive, organization and utterance of his immense acquisition of learning and of his insight into the ways of place-names is his monumental *Der Flussname Themse*, 1941. The subtitle *Studien zur Anglisierung keltischer Eigennamen und zur Lautchronologie*

¹ Mention might be made of another casualty, the *Disticha Catonis*, for which Förster had collected materials for a definitive edition; but, alas! Ironically prophetic were Frau Förster's lines in the *Schnitzelbank* (see below, p. 277):

Ist das nicht der alte Cato?
Niemals ward' er fertig, schad' oh!

des Altbritischen expresses the larger aspects of the work. It is a veritable encyclopaedia of Förster's philological life and riches. The text and notes run to 850 pages. Fortunately the book is generously indexed, some hundred pages, as follows: (1) proper names, (2) Germanic words, (3) Celtic words, (4) Latin and Romance words, (5) a very important Sachregister, mostly of grammatical elements and processes.

Interest in Thames as a river name must have been deep-lying and enduring. As the title-page indicates, the basic notions were set forth in a paper read before the Bavarian Academy in 1927. Frau Förster composed a sort of private *Schnitzelbank* in which she poked innocent fun at her husband's scholarly interests. She had made a series of amusing cartoons, each appropriate to its verse, to enliven the communal singing of the parody. This ritual of the *Schnitzelbank* was a cheerful pastime when there were appropriate guests at the Försters' apartment. The cartoon for the eleventh (at least, it was in 1932) verse presented a rather ribald-looking classical river god, thumbing his nose derisively, presumably at the distinguished professor, the object of the scherzo. The text of this verse ran:

Sagt hier nicht der Themse-fluss,
'Selbst *Du* weisst nichts Genaues! Schluss!'

It was in 1936, after his return from Yale, that Förster was free again to turn to his river-name studies. His letters afford glimpses of his progress. He wrote, on 25 December 1936:

I spent all my time on English river names, rewriting completely my Thames paper. I came more and more convinced that we cannot get beyond guessing if we do not settle as far as possible the (relative and absolute) chronology of Old Irish sound-changes. But for that you want a good knowledge of Breton and Cornish.

Four months later he reported:

I have to work hard at my Thames paper because 64 pages are already set up and I have not finished the paper yet. The more I work at the problem, the more difficulties I meet. But I like that kind of work immensely.

A month later he remarked, 'You are right. I am in danger of being drowned in the Thames.' By December 1937, he wrote:

With my Thames book I'm getting on very slowly. 113 pages have already been printed and read in proofs by me. But a good many more are still to follow. Reading the proof sheets turned out to be very tiring. I have to look up all the quotations from Old English as well as from Middle Welsh and occasionally from Old or Modern Breton or Cornish. More and more I am getting into Cornish, but I am far from knowing that language.

He added, characteristically:

Unfortunately I have had to let the Thames paper alone for quite a while in order to write a paper for the Schücking volume (60th birthday) on 'St Sativola or Sidwell'. I meant to write some six pages only, but somehow it grew to 48 printed pages.

And so Förster's Academy paper of 1927 grew until it reached the heroic dimensions of the *Themse-fluss* of 1941. It is a thoroughly expressionistic work, a revelation of himself. It becomes clear that, whatever his varied achievements in the many areas of his scholarly activity—and his fields of interest were varied, his range of knowledge almost cosmic, and his command of method and technique firm and sure—his liveliest skill and steadiest interest were in comparative and historical grammar, in particular as directed towards ways in which the forms and meanings of words and names could enrich the understanding of a text. He was, thus, a grammarian, a philologist, in the richest meanings of these two words. His Thames-book sums up and expresses the scholarly achievements of his lifetime; it is his personal *Reallexikon*, and his testament to learned men beyond his own city, nation, and time.

Preoccupation with bibliography, concentrating on linguistic and palaeographical scholarship, easily distracts attention from other aspects of Förster's professional life, in particular from his great concern with English literature of all periods and from his lively, rich, and imaginative activity as a teacher. He loved teaching: it is, I believe, accurate to say that in large part he loved scholarship because it energized his teaching. It was ever literature that gave significance to scholarship and it was through teaching that both were communicated to new generations of students. It was his concern for his students and his desire to bring them into an intimate and personal experience of English literature that caused him to make important texts readily available in anthologies: *British Classical Authors* (Herrig-Förster), from 1905; on *English Authors, with Biographical Notices*, from 1911 on; *English Poems*, 1912; *Altenglisches Lesebuch*, from 1913 on; *English Prose*, 1915. He touched in his research many aspects of English literature: *John Gilpin* and *Sister Helen*, to name but two. His letter of August 1947, cited above, (p. 274), shows him teaching Chaucer and Early Romantic literature in post-war Munich. Shakespeare was his great love, a devotion fittingly reflected in his years of service as one of the vice-presidents of the German Shakespeare Society. It is significant that, when his library was partially destroyed, it was the loss of his Shakespeare collection, a very rich section of his large library, that he most mourned. While the fruits of scholarship are tangible and commensurable, those of teaching, being ephemeral, personal, and volatile, are difficult to document. Those

who knew Förster and studied under him express affectionate gratitude for his skill and devotion in this difficult and precious art.

One word more, and that as to his situation after his return from America in 1936. He was then approaching seventy. His friends abroad realized what it must have been for him to see his dearly beloved country drive on towards calamity. He had international perspective. He knew and loved England and the British Isles, and he was proud of his membership of the British Academy; he came to know and love the United States. He knew the elementary facts of the domestic and international situation. He had suffered from the dominant power in his own country. His rich production in Anglistics and Celtology during the period after 1936 and up to the bombing of Munich was not only healing and creative but it was also a means of living in peace of mind, freely and luminously, in the ideal world of scholarship.

RUDOLPH WILLARD
University of Texas

SKELTON AND MUSIC: *ROTY BULLY JOYS*

THE poetry of John Skelton abounds with allusions to sacred music; one whole poem, 'Philip Sparrow', is couched in terms of the Requiem Mass.¹ Reference to secular music is somewhat rarer, but again, one entire poem, 'Against a Comely Coistrown', uses musical terms throughout. This is continued, though not so sharply, in the Latin appendage making up this 'sarcasmos, Contra alium cantitantem et organisantem asinum, qui impugnabat Skeltonida Pierium'. Historically the poem is important in being the first of Skelton's court satires (1495-6).² The victim of his pen here was evidently a person of lowly birth and status in life who had become a *succès de scandale* at court—"For Jack would be a gentleman, that late was a groom!"³ The unfortunate courtier, called Doctor Devias, master, minstrel, and fiddler, was probably a Flemish musician who had somehow incurred Skelton's wrath at the court of Henry VII, one that 'curiously chanted and currishly countered and madly in his musicks mockishly made against the ix. Muses of politic poems and poets matriculate'. The musician (called in the Latin verses a 'singing and instrument-playing ass') was

¹ See the excellent analysis by Ian A. Gordon, 'Skelton's "Philip Sparrow" and the Roman Service-Book', *M.L.R.*, xxix (1934), 389-96.

² See Ian A. Gordon, *John Skelton* (Melbourne and London, 1943), pp. 186-7, and L. J. Lloyd, *John Skelton* (Oxford, 1938), p. 32, for a discussion of this.

³ All quotations from Skelton's verse are taken from the second, revised edition of his works by Philip Henderson (London and Toronto, 1948).

apparently a popular teacher, although the products of his school, according to Skelton, were very poorly trained:

For lords and ladies learn at his school,
He teacheth them so wisely to solf and to fayne
That neither they sing well prick-song nor plain.

The poem has been adequately glossed with respect to much of its musical terminology;¹ and few readers will fail to understand the puns on such musical terms as *bass*, *mi*, *measure*, and *mean* which came to be conventional in Renaissance poetry:

He cannot find it in rule nor in space:
He solfas too haute, his treble is too high;
He braggeth of his birth, that born was full base;
His music without measure, too sharp is his *Mi*;
He trimmeth in his tenor to counter pardee;
His descant is busy, it is without a mean;
Too fat is his fancy, his wit is too lean.

One of the stanzas introduces an intriguing onomatopoeic phrase:

He lumb'reth on a lewd lute *Roty bully joys*,
Rumble down, tumble down, hey go, now, now!

What Skelton's erstwhile stableman mislaid on his lute was actually a dance-song found in a famous collection of fifteenth-century dances generally referred to as 'Basses Danses de la Bibliothèque de Bourgogne', now MS. 9085 in the Brussels Library.² The manuscript, which on palaeographical grounds is dated in the first third of the fifteenth century, once belonged to Marguerite of Austria (d. 1532), Governor of the Netherlands. Number fifty-five in the collection is 'Roti bouilly ioyeux en pas de breban'. The title here is obviously the opening phrase of a chanson; indeed, all the melodies in this volume are either dances with geographical titles (*La Rochelle*, *Portugaloise*) or chanson incipits. The whole collection is historically significant in showing that instrumental dance music (foreshadowing the orchestral suite), far from arising in the sixteenth century, existed as an independent category of music at the time of the Brussels manuscript.³

If 'Roti bouilli joyeux' originated in Brabant, it was also known in

¹ E. W. Naylor, *The Poets and Music* (London, 1928), pp. 142 ff.

² See the introduction and transcription by Ernest Closson, *Le Manuscrit dit des Basses Danses de la Bibliothèque de Bourgogne* (Bruxelles, 1912); and see Friedrich Blume, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Orchestersuite im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1925). The latter, Anhang B, p. 19, gives a modern transcription of 'Roti bouilli' and pp. 39 ff. discusses the *pas de breban*, as does Gustave Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (New York, 1954), p. 37. Neither Closson nor Blume mentions a text. In a private conversation, Professor Charles Van den Borren, the distinguished Belgian musicologist who has elsewhere catalogued the contents of this MS., assured me that he had never seen the words to 'Roti bouilli'.

³ Blume, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

Avignon in the first half of the fifteenth century, for a student in the university there in 1449 engaged a certain Jew, Mosse de Lisbonne, to teach him to play 'sur la *citara sive arpa* diverses chansons: . . . *Rostit bollit*'.¹ It was known, too, in fifteenth-century Scotland, for it is mentioned among other dances with geographical implications in 'Colkelbie Sow', a poem containing many Flemish allusions, including a story about how Flanders got its name: at one point in the narrative 'sum' danced to one tune and 'sum' to another,

Sum ourfute sum orliance
Sum rusty bully wt a bek.²

Skelton himself mentions the song some years after his first reference to it to call up exactly the same associations and to effect the same type of characterization as with the 'comely coistrown'—abuse of power at court—as Courtly Abusion in *Magnificence* (1516) enters singing, 'Rutty bully, jolly rutterkin, heyda!' Not only 'Roti bouilli' but the refrain to Skelton's 'Jolly Rutterkin' ('Hoyda, jolly rutterkin, hoyda!') reinforces the idea of the Flemish knight ('rutterkin') who made his money in the wool trade and aped his betters at court. Music and the wool trade, in fact, were inextricably mingled during the fifteenth century, when England for the first time occupied a central rather than peripheral role in musical art, succeeding France in leadership. Her chief contribution was a distinctive type of music characterized by triadic sonority crystallized in the *faux-bourdon* style; and it was in countries closely connected with England by the wool trade (Flanders, Burgundy) that this style exerted its greatest influence upon the Continent.³ Later influences upon England from the so-called Netherlandish School (comprising, for the most part, French and Flemish musicians) were also implemented by the trade in wool: it is especially interesting, for example, that the earliest known description of *musica reservata* appeared in Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (II. ix) after More, on a mission for Henry VIII to settle certain matters having to do with the wool trade, heard the singing in Antwerp Cathedral.

Although the words to the chanson 'Roti bouilli joyeux' apparently no longer exist, one may perhaps venture to guess that the song had its origin during the Anglo-French wars, and very possibly mocked the English for their love of 'jolly roast beef'. Originating in Brabant, it was current in France and Burgundy, and was probably brought to England with the wool

¹ André Pirro, 'L'Enseignement de la musique aux universités françaises', *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikgeschichte*, II (1930), 45, quoting from the *Annales d'Avignon et du Comtat venaisin*, VI. I (1919), 42.

² See *The Bannatyne Manuscript*, ed. W. Tod Ritchie (S.T.S., Edinburgh and London, 1928-30), IV. 201. I am indebted to Dr. John Stevens, Magdalene College, Cambridge, for calling 'Colkelbie Sow' to my attention.

³ See the discussion by Wilfred Mellers, *Music and Society* (New York, 1950), pp. 58 ff.

traders. Even later in the century Brabant appears to have had a reputation among English writers for love of dancing, as witness, for instance, the line twice spoken in *Love's Labour's Lost*: 'Did not I dance with you in Brabant once?' In satirizing Flemish *nouveaux riches* by reference to this Flemish *basse-danse*, in using it twice to heap derision upon the head of a Fleming who came to England and rose too quickly at court, Skelton is surely consistent in his attitude toward this melody. Elsewhere he frequently expresses approbation through musical allusion. Even Garnesche, Skelton admits in his flyting against that gentleman-usher, is sound in his musical knowledge: 'Though ye can skill of large and long' (these terms referring to basic time values in medieval notation). And Harvy Hafter in *The Bouge of Court* delivers a short lecture lamenting his lack of musical knowledge and skill:

Princes of Youth can ye sing by rote?
Or *Shall I sail with you* a fellowship assay?
For on the book I cannot sing a note.
Would to God, it would please you some day
A ballad book before me for to lay,
And learn me to sing *re mi fa sol*!
And, when I fail, bob me on the noll.

The exact musical knowledge shown by Skelton in 'Philip Sparrow', 'Against a Comely Coistrown', and parts of other poems is not surprising: according to his own words, Skelton was an alumnus of both Oxford and Cambridge, where, in medieval times, music played a far more important role than has generally been recognized.¹ The study of music as a branch of mathematics was regularly required of graduates in arts, along with the other six liberal arts; and the comprehensive treatise *De musica libri quinque* of Boethius was the required text in *musica speculativa* for centuries in many of the European universities, including Oxford and Cambridge. At the same time, instruction in *musica practica*—singing, instrumental performance, composition—was a part of the training of choristers in collegiate foundations where daily religious services necessitated the maintenance of a choir. Some students owed their opportunities for higher learning to the fact that they could sing, and were preferred among candidates for university scholarships when vacancies occurred. As for extra-curricular pastimes, students in the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge were so enthusiastic in singing, dancing, and playing musical instruments that the authorities were compelled at times to forbid these activities. At about the time of Skelton's academic career, moreover, music, long one of the seven liberal arts comprised in the philosophical faculty, became elevated to a separate

¹ See my article, 'The Study of Music at the University of Oxford in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Research in Music Education*, i (1953), 11-20.

faculty—the only one of the liberal arts to become one of the higher faculties like law, medicine, and theology—and separate degrees (baccalaureate and doctorate) in music were given to qualified candidates at the English universities from the late fifteenth century onward. A beautiful volume in the British Museum commemorates one of the earliest of these, Robert Fayrfax, whose incorporation as doctor of music from Cambridge—where ‘Doctor ffarefax’ is the only name under the heading ‘Inceptores in musica’ in 1503/4¹—is the earliest existing record (1511) of an Oxford doctorate in music.² Several of Skelton’s poems appear in the *Fayrfax Book*, set to music by various composers.

Is it not possible that Skelton himself received a thorough grounding in music, grammar, and *bonae litterae* as a chorister? This would help to explain a fact which most of Skelton’s biographers wonderingly point out—that he was a well-known poet and a finished scholar at about the age of thirty, when Caxton paid respectful tribute to his learning. By 1493 Skelton had been laureated at Oxford and Cambridge and at some continental university, generally thought to be Louvain, in the province of Brabant. Whether he actually studied at Louvain or was simply honoured by the university (possibly while accompanying Henry VII on his one foreign sortie)³ is not known. At any rate he may well have become acquainted with ‘Roti bouilli’ while in Brabant.

Erasmus addressed a laudatory poem to Skelton couched in musical metaphor which, if meant to be taken literally as well as figuratively, praised Skelton’s skill as a lutenist:⁴

At tibi Apollo Chelim
Auratam debit, et vocalia plectra sorores.
Inque tuis labiis
Dulcior hybleo residet suadela liquore;

¹ See *Grace Book B*, ed. Mary Bateson (Cambridge, 1903), i. 190 and 192.

² Anthony à Wood, *Fasti* (London, 1691), i. 652. For Fayrfax’s life, together with a catalogue and description of his works, see Dom Anselm Hughes, ‘An Introduction to Fayrfax’, *Musica Disciplina*, vi (1952), 83–104.

³ This is the conjecture made by H. L. R. Edwards, *Skelton* (London, 1949), p. 46.

⁴ From Egerton MS. 1651 in the British Museum, quoted by Preserved Smith, *Erasmus* (New York and London, 1923), pp. 453–4. Cf. Smith’s translation of the lines cited, p. 62:

But unto thee Apollo gave his lyre,
Thou playest the strings taught by the Muses’ choir;
Persuasion lies like honey on thy tongue
Given by Calliope, and thou hast sung
A song more sweet than dying swan’s by far,
And Orpheus self yields thee his own guitar,
And when thou strik’st it savage beasts grow mild,
Thou ledest oaks and stayest torrents wild,
And with thy soul-enchanting melodies
Thou meltest rocks.

Se tibi Calliope
 Infudit totam; tu carmine vincis olorem.
 Cedit et ipse tibi
 Ultro porrecta cithara Rhodopeius Orpheus.
 Tu modulante lyra
 Et mulcere feras et duras ducere quercus
 Tu potes et rapidos
 Flexanimis fidibus fluviorum sistere cursus;
 Flectere saxa potes.

If Skelton was indeed a lutenist himself, his allusion to the unskilled, ignorant lute of the stableman-courtier is all the more meaningful because the lute (which, incidentally, was strongly cultivated at Cambridge all through the Renaissance, with the first lute treatises and collections of lute music appearing from the hands of Cambridge graduates) was the instrument signifying ideals of courtesy, the perfect courtier, and the like to the more musical of the Tudor poets—as *par excellence* in the lyrics of Sir Thomas Wyatt. Thus the 'comely coistrown' lumbering on his lewd lute a song associated with rough Flemish knights in their cups ('Jolly Rutterkin') is a subtle and effective way of expressing abuse of court privilege, ignorance of, and disregard for, courtly ideals.

NAN COOKE CARPENTER

NATURE AND GRACE IN SPENSER: A REJOINDER

MR. ROBERT HOOPES has been so good as to call my attention to his article, 'God Guide Thee, Guyon' (*R.E.S.*, N.S. v (1954), 14-24) in which he very courteously takes me to task for misinterpreting *The Faerie Queene*, Book II. If I felt more certain that those who read Mr. Hoopes had also read my Tudor and Stuart lecture at Johns Hopkins (printed in *E.L.H.*, xvi (1949), 194-228) and hence were not dependent merely on Mr. Hoopes's summary and selection of evidence, I should risk the appearance of letting the question go by default.

In my lecture I advanced and tested the following hypothesis: that, in the part of *The Faerie Queene* which we possess, Spenser recognized and, for artistic and doctrinal purposes, employed the distinction between the order of nature and the order of grace, then familiar, however strangely it strikes upon the modern and more secular ear; that the primary reference in Book I, with its specifically Christian virtue of holiness and its constant invoking of religious motives and sanctions, is to the order of grace, and the primary reference in the remaining books, until we come to the last pronouncement in the 'Cantos of Mutabilitie', is to the order of nature; but that Spenser must have envisaged as the culmination of his poem a final synthesis of the two orders and their values, a synthesis for

which indeed he is preparing from the first, both by indicating on occasion the limits of natural reason and natural virtue and by the introduction of imagery suggesting a parallel between the two orders.

If I understand Mr. Hoopes aright, he sets out to prove that all this is mistaken, that in Book II Spenser does not prepare for a synthesis of the two orders but effects it, or rather, perhaps, does not require to synthesize since he has never distinguished at all between them, and that he invokes for Guyon's attainment of temperance and continence precisely the same religious motives and sanctions as for the Redcross Knight's attainment of holiness.

Now, the only evidence which Mr. Hoopes adduces for such motivation and sanction is drawn from Guyon's initial encounter with the Redcross Knight (II. i. 26-34), and is susceptible of quite different interpretation. The literary purpose of this episode is to link the second to the first book (cf. a similar linking in III. i. 5 ff.), and its doctrinal significance resides in the ready acknowledgement, prompted by reason, of the superiority of grace to nature, which depends of course on the prior recognition of a clear distinction between them. If the Palmer's statement that Guyon 'Must now anew begin like race to runne' means that Guyon must win a seat among the saints and not simply, as the Redcross Knight had also done, win through to his appropriate virtue and the fulfilment of his task, why is there no hint, in the remaining eleven cantos, of religious motive and sanction or of Guyon's having attained or even progressed towards a seat among the saints? Why are the patent parallels between Guyon's adventures and those of the Redcross Knight always exploited so as to bring out the contrast between them; or why (to take a specific example) does Guyon prepare himself for his final task in the humanistic Castle of Alma instead of in some religious retreat like the House of Holiness? And since when were the Aristotelian temperance and continence specifically Christian virtues (i.e. virtues attainable only by the Christian and on religious grounds) as holiness clearly is? And why is Guyon referred to (II. viii. 1) in terms appropriate to the natural man, but to the convert utterly inappropriate? These and a good many other questions Mr. Hoopes studiously ignores, presumably because he has no answers for them.

He makes much of the fact that God's aid is invoked (II. i. 32), and it is vouchsafed (II. viii). But why should it not be? For the natural order is also God's, and over it God's power and providence preside. In his definitions of both nature and grace (as in definition in general) Mr. Hoopes is at his weakest. Through most of his article he thinks of nature too restrictedly and of grace too loosely. Thus (p. 16) he attributes to me the assertion that (in II. viii) Arthur represents 'the operation of grace *within* nature'. I said

nothing of the kind, for the good reason that the phrase would be meaningless unless (like Mr. Hoopes) one were using *grace* merely as a synonym for God's bounty to all His creatures, manifested as providential intervention in the natural order, a sense in reality quite distinct from that in which Arthur in Book I represents the working of divine grace upon the heart of the believer. Of the ambivalence of the word *grace* Spenser was perfectly conscious, and probably designed to turn it to account in the final synthesis for which he was preparing; but ambivalence in Spenser too often becomes confusion in his critics.

It is always possible to determine from the context the primary sense in which the word *grace* is being used (as I illustrated in my article by distinguishing some of its principal meanings; see p. 207, n. 24), and it is necessary to do so if one is to follow Spenser's argument and appreciate at their true value the secondary suggestions conveyed. But this necessary, indeed elementary, step in criticism Mr. Hoopes's argument will not permit him to take. Thus in commenting on II. viii. 51-52 (p. 19) he speaks of Arthur's offer to Pyrochles of Christian forgiveness upon repentance and points triumphantly to the words, 'Wroth was the Prince, and sory yet withall / That he so wilfully refused grace'. But the primary meaning of *grace* here is rendered unmistakable by the context: it is not heavenly grace that is meant but, in Spenser's own words, Arthur's 'princely bounty and great mind' (i.e. magnanimity) which prompt him to spare a vanquished foe for his 'valiaunce'. If there is a secondary suggestion—if this is as it were a faint image on the natural level—of God's offer of grace to sinners on their repentance, it is one more example of Spenser's, not effecting, but preparing for, his final synthesis. And if Arthur in Book II represents divine grace (as Mr. Hoopes seems to maintain), why does he himself in the encounter with Maleger (II. xi) come so near to defeat, have to be in effect rescued by providential intervention, using weak things (i.e. Timias) as its instrument (30-31), and appeal from nature to grace (symbolized by water) for the destruction of Maleger (46)? In this connexion, I may perhaps be allowed to remind Mr. Hoopes that my interpretation of Spenser's meaning and purpose led me to offer for the first time an explanation of Maleger which accounted for *all* his attributes, namely, that he stood for Original Sin, an explanation which Mr. Hoopes treats as if it were a critical commonplace, but which his interpretation could not have originated and can, I think, barely tolerate. Indeed, on his interpretation Spenser's sense of the limits of natural virtue is obscured and loses most, if not quite all, of its significance. Thus he passes over in silence the striking and unexpected parallel, in v. ix. 29-32, read in the light of v. x. 1, where, having learned justice and equity as natural virtues, Arthur and Artegall must learn the principle of mercy (as distinct from the unorganized sentiment of pity)

from a Christian source. And finally his interpretation precludes his adopting my justification (the only one, I believe, ever offered) of Spenser's artistry in the double ending of Book II with an heroic exploit by Guyon and another by Arthur.

Mr. Hoopes summarizes my argument in such terms as he feels himself capable of dealing with and silently omits all the evidence which his own interpretation is unable to explain. Some of the questions which he must answer, if he is to establish a *prima-facie* case, I have rapidly suggested above; but I hope that the few readers interested may perhaps do me the justice of reading my original article. Mr. Hoopes seeks a tactical advantage in bracketing me with the late Professor F. M. Padelford (a great Spenserian, with whom in reality it is too much honour to be named) in regarding Spenser as a Calvinist instead of as an Elizabethan Anglican. The antithesis is, of course, no antithesis at all, as any one who had read Archbishop Whitgift might have told Mr. Hoopes. I did not mention, let alone call in question, Spenser's loyalty to the Elizabethan Settlement or the Thirty-nine Articles; but evidently Mr. Hoopes's notions about Calvinism are not more exact than his definitions of nature and grace. What I emphasized was some hesitation in Spenser's attitude towards nature between views which might be conveniently associated with Calvinism and others which suggested rather the tradition to which Hooker was about to give its most eloquent expression (for it was I, and not Mr. Hoopes, who first brought Hooker into the discussion); and of this hesitation there is evidence in other works—for example, in the *Fowre Hymnes* (as appears in Padelford's exposition of them).

Nothing in Mr. Hoopes's argument is more unconvincing than his final effort to level Guyon and the Christ of *Paradise Regained*, which entails an excursion into the misinterpretation of Milton, and in effect a lowering of Christ to meet the levitated Guyon half-way. Granted that Christ is tested in the temptation as man; yet we are never allowed to forget that he is at once the Son of God and the 'second Adam', who by his obedience is regaining all that the first Adam by disobedience lost, or that his motivation is purely and simply religious, namely, loving submission and obedience to the Father, and that it is as a result of this religious motivation that Christ becomes 'this perfect man', the great exemplar of magnanimity, of temperance, and of every other virtue which natural reason could conceive. But to return to Spenser: we do him wrong if, by impetuously hurrying him on to his final synthesis, we obscure all his preliminary distinctions, not to mention the finer points of his artistry, and attribute to him at every stage of the journey meanings which we are unable to support by a single reliable reference in his text.

I would not, however, end on a note of complaint. One very valuable

contribution Mr. Hoopes tucks away in a footnote (p. 21, n. 1): it is the quotation from Wither's preface to the translation of Nemesis on the *Nature of Man*, and I thank him for reminding me of it. For, though it is not specially relevant to Book II, it is to the final synthesis for which Spenser seems to be preparing, a synthesis which (as I insisted) could be achieved only by the subordination of nature to grace, and for which (as I tried to show) he prepares first by distinguishing the two orders, then by adumbrating in his imagery and in other ways a parallel between them. Indeed, I would be willing to compromise with Mr. Hoopes by accepting as an epigraph, not for Book II, but for *The Faerie Queene* as a whole, the two quotations, mine from *The Ancient Bounds* and his from George Wither.

A. S. P. WOODHOUSE

'THIS WORD SATYRE'

O. J. CAMPBELL draws attention to Renaissance confusions between *satire* and *satyr* and points out that they helped to determine the English satiric style of the time.¹ A poem prefaced to Thomas Drant's collection of satires (all but one translated from Horace), *A Medicinable Morall* (1566, sig. A4^v), is of interest in this connexion, and since he does not mention it I give it here.

Priscus Grammaticus de Satyra.

Satyra est carmen acerbum, instrumentum mordax, &c.

A Satyre, is a tarte and carpyng kynd of verse,
An instrument to pynche the pranks of men,
And for as muche as pynchyng instrumentes do perse,
Yclept it was full well a Satyre then.

A name of Arabique to it they gaue:
For Satyre there, doothe signifie a glaue.

Or *Satyra*, of *Satyrus*, the mossye rude,
Vnciuile god: for those that wyll them write
With taunting gyrdes & glikes and gibes must vex the lewde,
Strayne curtesy: ne reck of mortall spyte.

Shrouded in Mosse, not shrynkynge for a shower
Deemyng of mosse as of a regall bower.

Satyre of writhled waspyshe Saturne may be namde
The Satyryst must be a wasper in moode,
Testie and wrothe with vice and hers, to see bothe blamde
But courteous and frendly to the good.

¹ *Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida* (San Marino, 1938), pp. 35-37.

As Saturne cuttes of tymes with equall sythe:
 So this man cuttes downe synne, to coy and blythe.

Or *Satyra* of *Satur*, thauthors must be full
 Of fostred arte, infarst in ballasde breste.
 To teach the worldlyngs wyt, whose witched braines are dull
 The worste wyll pardie hearken to the best.

If that the Poet be not learnde in deede,
 Muche maye he chatte, but fewe wyll marke his reede.

Lusill, (I wene) was parent of this nyppyng ryme:
 Next hudlyng *Horace*, braue in Satyres grace.
 Thy praysed Pamphlet (*Persie*) well detected cryme
 Syr *Iuuenall* deserues the latter place.

The Satyryst loues Truthe, none more then he.
 An vtter foe to fraude in eache degree.

It would be interesting to know what passage from what early grammarian this poem translates, but if it is extant I have been unable to locate it. The closest parallel I can offer is the fairly well-known passage in Diomedes, from Book III of his *Ars grammatica*, a passage sometimes mistakenly attributed to Priscian, since it was incorporated by Raban Maur¹ into his *Excerptio de arte grammatica Prisciani*:

Satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaearum comoediae caractere conpositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius et Persius. et olim carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius. satira autem dicta sive a Satyris, quod similiter in hoc carmine ridiculae res pudendaeque dicuntur, quae velut a Satyris proferuntur et fiunt: sive satira a lance quae referta variis multisque primitiis in sacro apud priscos dis inferebatur et a copia ac saturitate rei satira vocabatur; cuius generis lancium et Vergilius in georgicis meminit, cum hoc modo dicit,

lancibus et pandis fumantia reddimus exta

et

lancesque et liba feremus:

sive a quodam genere farciminis, quod multis rebus refertum saturam dicit Varro vocitatum. est autem hoc positum in secundo libro Plautinarum quaestionum, 'satura est uva passa et polenta et nuclei pini ex mulso consparsi'. ad haec alii addunt et de malo punico grana. alii autem dictam putant a lege satira, quae uno rogatu multa simul comprehendat, quod scilicet et satira carmine multa simul poemata comprehenduntur. cuius saturae legis Lucilius meminit in primo,

¹ See Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, cxi, cols. 668-9, where a confused text yields an early satirist called Carmem.

per saturam aedilem factum qui legibus solvat,
et Sallustius in Iugurtha, 'deinde quasi per saturam sententiis exquisitis in
deditionem accipitur'.¹

But here there is no mention of an 'Arabique' word meaning a sword, which is Drant's most curious etymology, and one that I have not met elsewhere. Presumably he, or rather his grammarian, alludes to the Arabic and Persian word ساطور [sātūr], meaning a butcher's cleaver, derived from the Arabic root سَطَرَ. For his part Drant's grammarian altogether misses the *lanx* derivation, which is respectable even today, though his 'mossye rude, Vnciuile god' is evidently a *σάτυρος*, and so one more example, and an early one, of this particular confusion.

As is generally known, the false connexion between *satire* and *satyr* was first influentially attacked by Isaac Casaubon, in his *De satyrica graecorum poesi et romanorum satira libri duo* (Paris, 1605). Another Frenchman, Pierre Le Roy, came close to offering a more acceptable etymology more than ten years earlier, as can be seen from the English translation of his work, *A Pleasant Satyre or Poesie*, printed in 1595:

... all they which haue bin brought vp in learning, knowe very well, that this word Satyre, doth not only signifie a poesie, containing euill speech in it, for the reproofe, either of publike vices, or of particular faults of some certaine persons, of which sort are those of Lucilius, Horace, Iuuenal, and Persius: but also all sortes of writings, replenished with sundry matters, and diuers argumentes, hauing prose and verse intermixed or mingled therewithall, as if it were powdred neats tongues interlarded. Varro saith, that in ancient times, men called by this name, a certaine sorte of pie or pudding, into which men put diuers kindes of hearbes, and of meates. (sig. Aa^v)

The next sentence ('But I suppose that the word commeth from the Græcians...') at once veers away from this, however, and we are with the *σάτυροι* again.

Undoubtedly it was the satire-satyr muddle that did most to persuade Elizabethan satirists that their poems could be satires proper only if they were barbarously phrased, and undoubtedly Campbell was right to concentrate on this particular misapprehension. But Drant's poem is significant too in that it indicates other misapprehensions, tending mainly in the same direction. If his epigrams were sufficiently familiar for Meres to number him among the English epigrammatists¹ perhaps *A Medicinable Morall* was also familiar, or its *priscus grammaticus*, and familiar to those who followed him in writing and printing satires.

JOHN PETER

¹ *Grammatici Latini*, ed. Heinrich Keil (Leipzig, 1857), i. 485-6.

² *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford, 1937), ii. 321.

HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS IN ABSALOM AND ACHITOPHEL

A NUMBER of Dryden's references to persons and events in this poem are still problematic, and some of the traditional identifications are open to question. To the discussion of these problems published by Mr. E. S. de Beer in this journal in 1941,¹ the following notes are offered as a supplement.

(i) Amnon

What faults he had (for who from faults is free?)
His Father could not, or he would not see.
Some warm excesses, which the Law forbore,
Were constru'd Youth that purg'd by boyling o'r:
And *Amnon's* Murther, by a specious Name,
Was call'd a Just Revenge for injur'd Fame. (ll. 35-40)

Scott notes that Monmouth had been involved in the murder of a beadle near Whetstone Park in February 1671, but takes these lines as a reference to the vicious though not homicidal attack on Sir John Coventry made a few weeks earlier. Mr. de Beer suggests that Amnon was Monmouth's brother-in-law William Fanshawe, from whom the Duke had withdrawn his patronage; but this stretches the meaning of 'Murther' too far. Scott's explanation is the most satisfactory, but it requires more detailed consideration than he gave to it.

An account of Coventry's misadventure is contained in a letter from Marvell to William Popple c. 24 January 1670/1:

Sir John Coventry having moved for an Imposition on the Playhouses, *Sir John Berkenhead*, to excuse them, sayed they had been of great Service to the King. Upon which *Sir John Coventry* desired that Gentleman to explain, whether he meant the Men or Women Players. Hereupon it is imagined, that, the House adjourning from Tuesday before till Thursday after Christmas Day, on the very Tuesday Night of the Adjournment twenty five of the *Duke of Monmouth's* Troop, and some few Foot, layed in Wait from ten at Night till two in the Morning, by *Suffolk-Street*, and as he returned from the *Cock*, where he supped, to his own House, they threw him down, and with a Knife cut off almost all the End of his Nose. . . . *Sir Thomas Sands*, Lieutenant of the Troop, commanded the Party; and *Obrian*, the *Earl of Inchequin's* Son, was a principal Actor. The Court hereupon sometimes thought to carry it with an high Hand, and question *Sir John* for his Words, and maintain the Action. Sometimes they flagged in their Counsels. However the King commanded *Sir Thomas Clarges*, and *Sir W. Pultney*, to release *Wroth* and *Lake*, who were two of the Actors, and taken.²

¹ R.E.S., xvii (1941), 298-309.

² *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth (Oxford, 1927), ii. 307.

Here, as elsewhere in the poem, Dryden does not intend a complete parallel to the Biblical history of Absalom. Neither the family relationships nor the occasion of the original story of Amnon, son of David, who ravished his sister Tamar and was slain in revenge by his brother Absalom (2 Sam. xiii), have any parallel in the history of Monmouth. But Marvell's account resembles the story of Amnon in four respects. (i) Both Amnon and Coventry sullied the honour of the royal house, and suffered 'Revenge for injur'd Fame'. (ii) Coventry was attacked on his way home from a tavern in the small hours, and Amnon was murdered when he was 'merry with wine'. (iii) Neither Absalom nor Monmouth took part in the assault, but exhorted their following to action:

Now Absalom had commanded his servants, saying, Mark ye now when Amnon's heart is merry with wine, and when I say unto you, Smite Amnon; then kill him, fear not: have not I commanded you? be courageous, and be valiant. And the servants of Absalom did unto Amnon as Absalom had commanded. (2 Sam. xiii. 28-29.)

(iv) Both David and Charles II condoned the offence; and Tories familiar with Scripture would recall with amusement the unintentional irony at the end of the story, 'And the soul of King David longed to go forth unto Absalom: for he was comforted concerning Amnon, seeing he was dead' (v. 39).

(ii) Balaam and Caleb

Titles and Names 'twere tedious to Reherse
Of Lords, below the Dignity of Verse.

And, therefore in the Name of Dulness, be
The well hung *Balaam* and cold *Caleb* free. (ll. 569-74)

'Well hung' is probably a double *entendre*, both meanings suiting the Biblical Balaam. (i) 'Fluent'—Firth quotes Oldham, 'Imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal':

Flippant of talk and voluble of tongue,
With words at will, no lawyer better hung.

So Balaam is summoned by Balak to curse the invading Israelites, 'for I wot that he whom thou blessest is blessed, and that he whom thou cursest is cursed' (Numbers xxii. 5-6). (ii) 'Having large genitals, licentious'—compare *Absalons IX Worthies* (1682), a satire on the Whig leaders written shortly after *Absalom and Achitophel* and of some value as a commentary on the poem:

The next *Priapus-Balaam*, of whom 'tis said,
His Brains did lye more in his Tail than's Head.

¹ Cf. *Priapeia*, lii. 7, 'pulchre pensilibus peculiati'.

It is held against the church in Pergamos that some follow the doctrine of Balaam, 'who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication' (Revelation ii. 14).

Mr. de Beer suggests that 'Balaam' may be Lord Grey of Wark (see below); but there are good reasons for keeping to the traditional identification with Theophilus Hastings, seventh Earl of Huntingdon. (i) In *Absalons IX Worthies* Balaam is described as

Sprouted of Royal Stem in ancient dayes,
'Tis an ill Bird that his own Nest bewrayes.

Henry, third Earl of Huntingdon, was regarded by Cecil and the Protestant party as a possible successor to Elizabeth I, and the royal connexions of the family had been recalled in the elaborate title of the *Lachrymae Musarum* (1649) to which Dryden contributed 'Upon the Death of Lord Hastings': '... Onely Sonn of the Right Honourable *Ferdinando* Earl of *Huntingdon* Heir-generall of the high born Prince *George* Duke of *Clarence*, Brother to King *Edward* the fourth.' (ii) Huntingdon was one of the boisterous adherents of Shaftesbury, 'bewraying his own nest'. At a banquet in December 1679 he

desired leave of y^e L^d Maior to begin a health, and begun y^e Duke of Monmouth's health; w^{ch}, when it came to y^e L^d Ch. J[ustice] he pledged it, expressing withall a great honour for y^e Duke, and, after, desired leave . . . and then drunk to my L^d Huntingdon y^e Duke of York's health. The L^d Huntingdon replied: 'And confusion to Popery!' The L^d Chief J. answered: 'Yes, y^e Duke of York's health, and confusion to Popery!' Y^e L^d Howard said y^t wase a contradiction . . . all y^e L^{ds}, in a great scuffle, rise from y^e table and went into another roome

where followed a heated dispute between the Lord Chief Justice and Shaftesbury.¹ (iii) But Huntingdon did not become more involved with Shaftesbury than did Balaam with Balak, and Charles, assured of his penitence, received him back into favour about a month before *Absalom* and *Achitophel* appeared.² So Balaam 'loved the wages of unrighteousness; but was rebuked for his iniquity' (2 Peter ii. 15-16) and, to Balak's bewilderment, repented of his notion of cursing Israel: 'And Balak said unto Balaam, What hast thou done unto me? I took thee to curse mine enemies, and behold, thou hast blessed them altogether' (Numbers xxiii. 11).

'Cold *Caleb*' cannot be certainly identified. The Key published with the poem in 1716 gives Ford, Lord Grey of Wark, one of Monmouth's supporters and closest friends; and Scott explains 'cold' as a reference to Grey's apparent indifference to an affair between Lady Grey and Monmouth in

¹ *Hatton Correspondence* (Camden Society, 1878), i. 208-9.

² See *Hist. MSS. Comm., Ormonde*, vi. 204 (18 Oct. 1681).

January 1680. The Biblical Caleb promised to give his daughter as a prize to him 'that smiteth Kirjath-sepher, and taketh it' (Joshua xv. 16-17); but this needs stretching to fit the affair of Lady Grey. Further, *Absalons IX Worthies* annotates the epithet 'cold' in a way which does not accord with what we know of Grey:

Chast *Caleb* next, whose chill embraces charm
Women to Ice, was yet in Treason warm;
O'th ancient Race of *Jewish* Nobles come,
Whose Title never lay in *Christendome*.

Grey was sufficiently concerned to carry his wife into Northumberland as a result of the gossip about her and Monmouth;¹ and his chastity is belied by his trial in 1682 for debauching his sister-in-law Henrietta Berkeley.²

In Nesse's *A Key (With the Whip) To open the Mystery & Iniquity of . . . Absalom and Achitophel* (1682)³ Caleb is identified as Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex; and Mr. de Beer has pointed to the resemblance of 'Capel' and 'Caleb'. The epithet 'cold' is apt for Essex. Charles thought him 'stiff and sullen', Temple speaks of his 'usual dryness', and Evelyn describes him as a 'sober, wise, judicious, and pondering person' of 'sober and religious deportment'.⁴ His temper suits with that of Caleb, who 'wholly followed the Lord' (Joshua xiv. 14); and the allusion in *Absalons IX Worthies* to a title outside Christendom may be to Essex's diligent and effective service as viceroy in Ireland 1672-7.⁵

(iii) Agag

His Zeal to heav'n, made him his Prince despise,
And load his person with indignities:
But Zeal peculiar priviledge affords;
Indulging latitude to deeds and words.
And *Corah* might for *Agag's* murther call,
In terms as course as *Samuel* us'd to *Saul*. (ll. 672-7)

The Key printed in 1716, followed by modern editors, identifies Agag with Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, a London magistrate and a strict Protestant, who was found dead in mysterious circumstances on 17 October 1678 and was said to have been murdered by Papists. Whatever the solution of

¹ Elizabeth D'Oyley, *James Duke of Monmouth* (London, 1938), p. 162.

² See *State Trials* (1776), iii. 519-44.

³ Published by 13 Jan. See Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: A Bibliography* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 225-6.

⁴ Burnet, *History*, ed. O. Airy (Oxford, 1900), i. 493 and ii. 108, note; H. C. Foxcroft, *A Character of the Trimmer* (Cambridge, 1946), p. 70; Evelyn, *Diary*, 13 July 1683.

⁵ See Burnet, *op. cit.*, ii. 109-10.

this mystery,¹ there is no evidence that Oates 'called' for Godfrey's murder; and in *The Kings Evidence Justifi'd; or Doctor Oates's Vindication of Himself and the Reality of the Plot* (1679) Oates declared that the Papists 'by that silly and impolitic Murther of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey rather pour'd oyl then water upon the Fire, and fed that into a blazing Flame, which else they might have easily quench'd, and puffed away the Smoke'.² Mr. de Beer takes Agag to be Lord Chief Justice Scroggs, against whom Oates brought articles of 'high misdemeanour' after Scroggs had summed up in favour of the accused at Wakeman's trial. But there is little resemblance between the Hebrew Agag and Scroggs.

The most likely identification is with Lord Stafford. (i) When the Amalekites were slaughtered at the instigation of Samuel, 'Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them' (1 Sam. xv. 8-9). Stafford, the senior of the five Catholic peers accused of high treason during 'the Plot' in 1678, was committed to prison, saved by Charles's prorogation of Parliament on 30 January 1679, and held for two years while other prosecutions were carried through to a conclusion. (ii) Both Saul and Charles II showed reluctance to comply with 'opposition' insistence on the execution of their prisoners—Charles's attempts to mitigate the horrors of the prosecutions were generally known, and even when Stafford had been condemned, he risked the anger of the Commons by commuting the penalty of hanging, drawing, and quartering to one of decapitation.³ (iii) Samuel 'called' to Saul for the death of Agag (1 Sam. xv. 11-23). It was on Oates's accusations that Stafford was imprisoned, and on Oates's evidence that he was condemned.⁴ (iv) When Samuel summoned Agag,

Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past. And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal. (1 Sam. xv. 32-33.)

Stafford, aged, timid, and pathetic, endured his trial with fortitude. When he heard the verdict, he said: 'God's holy Name be praised. I confess I am surprised at it, but God's will be done, and your Lordships'.⁵ (v) Dryden cites Corah's demand for the death of Agag as an illustration of insults to the King. 'One thing my Lord [Stafford] said as to Oates' during the trial 'did exceedingly affect' the gentlemanly Evelyn:

¹ See David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 564-9, 579-84.

² Jane Lane, *Titus Oates* (London, 1949), p. 123.

³ Arthur Bryant, *King Charles II* (London, 1936), pp. 279-80 and note, 306-7; John Pollock, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1944), pp. 369-70.

⁴ Lane, *op. cit.*, pp. 126, 248-52; Pollock, *op. cit.*, pp. 360-71.

⁵ Lane, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

That a person who during his depositions should so vauntingly brag that though he went over to the Church of Rome, yet he was never a Papist, nor of their religion . . . but only as a spy; . . . that such an hypocrite, that had so deeply prevaricated as even to turn idolater . . . I say, that the witness of such a profligate wretch should be admitted against the life of a peer,—this my Lord looked upon as a monstrous thing, and such as must needs redound to the dishonour of our religion and nation. And verily I am of his Lordship's opinion: such a man's testimony should not be taken against the life of a dog.¹

(iv) Issachar

Each house receives him as a Guardian God;
And Consecrates the Place of his aboad:
But hospitable treats did most Commend
Wise *Issachar*, his wealthy western friend. (ll. 735-8)

Issachar is Thomas Thynne of Longleat in Wiltshire, known as 'the Protestant Squire' on account of his affiliation to Shaftesbury's party, and as 'Tom of Ten Thousand' on account of his wealth. Thynne was a generous friend to Monmouth, and entertained him twice at Longleat during the progress of 1680 to which Dryden refers. 'Wise *Issachar*' is an ironical echo of the Biblical description of Issachar as 'a strong ass' (Genesis xlix. 14-15): compare *A Satyr* attributed to Rochester, line 36, 'who'd be safe and senseless like *Tom Thinn*?'²

Editors have explained Dryden's choice of a name for Thynne on the simple grounds of Thynne's being an ass. But the Hebrew Issachar was more: 'a strong ass couching down between two burdens: And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute'. The two burdens borne by Tom of Ten Thousand were (i) the expense of supporting and entertaining Monmouth; (ii) Lady Ogle. Since July 1681 (while *Absalom and Achitophel* was in the making) Thynne had courted Elizabeth, widow of Lord Ogle who died in November 1680; and the news of their marriage came out early in November 1681.

They say she raild much at [her friends] of late . . . in that they have abused her in making her beleieve he had 20,000 a yeare, was of a better family, and but 23 yeares old. He has never layn wth her since he was married, not so much as spoken to her, nay, scarce seen her, and says she never will. Besides, I heere my Lady Trevor will prosecute him as married to her daughter, and says she can prove it. If it be but a contract, they say 'twill breake y^e marriage wth Lady Ogle. They say y^t Thinne has given bonds for vast summes of mony to her friends upon this account.³

¹ *Diary*, 6 Dec. 1680.

² *Poems by John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*, ed. V. de S. Pinto (London, 1953), p. 135.

³ *Hatton Correspondence*, ii. 9.

Lady Ogle brought further financial burdens with her: 'She has 2000¹ a yeare gointer, and she must give 20000¹ to my L^d Newcastle for it, in [whose] power it is now to make his daughters great fortunes, and thay doe stand in need of it.'¹ Thynne's burdens must have been a joke of the town when Dryden was finishing his poem. In choosing a Hebrew pseudonym for Thynne, he must have remembered what he had written for Gomez in *The Spanish Fryar* (III. ii; first performed in March 1680):

Dominic. How dar'st thou reproach the Tribe of *Levi*?

Gomez. Marry, because you make us Lay-men of the Tribe of *Issachar*: you make Asses of us, to bear your burthens: when we are young, you put Paniers upon us, with your Church-discipline; and when we are grown up, you load us with a Wife . . . a fine phrase you have amongst you to draw us into Marriage, you call it Settling of a Man; just as when a fellow has got a sound Knock upon the head, they say he's settled: Marriage is a settling Blow indeed.

JAMES KINSLEY

MATTHEW ARNOLD AND A REVIEWER

'AFTER the noisy din of angry polemic this ever gentle voice is as welcome to the weary ear as the rustling of wind over the corn after the clattering of horses' hooves along the stones of a crowded street.' So a reviewer in the *Athenaeum* for 8 March 1879 commended the *Mixed Essays* of Matthew Arnold.² Comparing Arnold to Symonds, Pater, and Swinburne, he found him 'more close to mankind than they', while at the same time excelling two others—John Morley and Pattison—in 'fascinating suavity'. The only legitimate comparison, concluded the reviewer, could be with the seventeenth-century Lord Falkland, who saw both sides but was unwilling to commit himself. Indeed, the only flaw in Arnold's essays which the reviewer detected was that on Goethe. Arnold was delighted, and lost little time in telling the editor of the *Athenaeum*, Norman MacColl. Writing from Cobham on 15 March, he expressed his pleasure:

My dear Sir,

I must not let the week go by without thanking you for the article in last Saturday's *Athenaeum*. It is worth while to have passed all one's life 'out in the cold', so far as the public is concerned, to be so kindly brought in and treated in one's old age. Nothing too could be more serviceable to the book than the line followed in the article. Accept my cordial thanks for yourself and for the writer, and believe me, dear Sir,

most truly yours,
Matthew Arnold.³

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

¹ *Ibid.*, i. 240.

² *Athenaeum*, 8 March 1879, p. 303.

³ British Museum, Add. MS. 41340A.

CORRESPONDENCE

LOCKE'S TRAVELS IN FRANCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*

Sir,

I have received with appropriate humility and gratitude the corrections to my edition of Locke's Travels in France offered by your reviewer in the number for July 1954. (i) By a deplorable lapse I omitted the entry for 27 January 1679, which reads: 'Prayers for the dead. The ancient prayers for the dead and the masse pro mortuis wherein also the Apostles are mentiond was noe other wise but that god would hasten the resurrection. Mr Fromentin.' (ii) I did not discover until a few months ago that the town which Locke refers to as 'Chatres', 'Charter', and 'Chartres' was Arpajon, which changed its name from Châtres in the eighteenth century. (iii) Although I have been unable to consult the *Complete Baronetage*, I take your reviewer's word that Sir John Newton *does* appear in it.

I must confess that my gratitude would have been greater if, in pointing out these regrettable lapses, your reviewer had not seen fit to indulge in so many quibbling criticisms and unfounded imputations. It is characteristic of the general tenor of the whole review that my work, in the introduction and notes, in examining the main point of interest of this part of the Locke papers—the light which they throw on so many aspects of French civilization at the height of the reign of Louis XIV—receives four lines of grudging acknowledgement.

In the space at my disposal I must content myself with examining two characteristically myopic judgements. The notes to my edition, which many reviewers have found too detailed, are dismissed as 'far too frequently casual marginalia'. After several years' labour I succeeded in identifying ninety-nine fairly obscure Frenchmen and Englishmen mentioned in Locke's Journal, but because I failed to look in the right place for the hundredth, a certain Abbé de Galinée who appears neither in the *Biographie Universelle* nor in the *Grande Encyclopédie* nor in the printed catalogues of the British Museum and Bibliothèque Nationale, I am treated to half a paragraph of reproach. 'Mr. Lough . . .', says your reviewer severely, 'does not give even the map-maker's correct name. He is R. Brehan de Gallinée.' But his correct name is given by Locke himself: it is 'Abbé de Galinée'. His full name, correctly spelt, is 'René de Bréhant (or Bréhan) de Galinée'. I went out of my way to draw the attention of specialists in the early history of Canada to the possible interest of what Locke has to say on the subject; I added a special footnote (duly indexed) to my introduction (p. xli). In return your reviewer reads me a lecture . . . on the possible interest of these passages.

Again, bearing in mind that my edition might be consulted by people who were not steeped in seventeenth-century English, I spent a great deal of time in providing definitions of words which were likely to give trouble. It must be a matter of opinion where one should draw the line in such matters, but French reviewers in particular have expressed gratitude for such help. They have not found that my notes were 'pitched far too low'.

J. LOUGH

REVIEWS

Beowulf and Judith. Edited by ELLIOTT VAN KIRK DOBBIE. Pp. c+289 (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records IV). New York: Columbia University Press, 1953; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954. 40s. net.

With this volume—which went to press before the appearance of Professor Wrenn's *Beowulf* and Dr. Timmer's *Judith*—the series that began with G. P. Krapp's edition of the Junius MS. in 1931 is worthily concluded. For the sake of completeness it had to be done; but *Beowulf* has been so worked over that an edition on this plan, though it must have been a most exacting task, could hardly hope to make any very substantial original contribution. It is in effect a sort of selected *variorum* text, giving in the Introduction only as much historical and literary background as a reader will find essential to a plain understanding of the poem.

As in earlier volumes of the series, the text is kept relatively free from 'the trail of the passing editor'. Readings of the two Thorkelin transcripts in agreement are treated in the same way as those of the manuscript, and emendations are not distinguished typographically, though of course rejected forms are recorded in footnotes. But certain typographical distinctions are made, and here there is some inconsistency. Letters vouched for by only one of the two Thorkelin transcripts are italicized, and 'conjectural restorations of matter now missing or illegible in the manuscript' are marked off by square brackets. Yet whole words which are not in the manuscript at all, but which are supplied editorially because sense or metre is thought to require them, are not distinguished. These supplied words (of which as many as twenty-seven are noticed in the footnotes) are no less, and often more, 'conjectural' than the bracketed restorations, and surely deserve as much prominence. The contrast is particularly striking between single words so supplied (e.g. *sohte* 139, *secgum* 149) and only slightly larger gaps in sense or metre which are marked by asterisks, as *hider ofer holmas? * * * le wæs* 240. A minor, but ugly, inconsistency appears in the preservation in the text of the rune for *epel* in ll. 520, 913, and 1702, when other abbreviations, e.g. for *ond*, are silently expanded; and *XVna sum* 207 is scarcely better. It is a pity that the section numbers in both *Beowulf* and *Judith* have been omitted from the text and relegated to a table in the Introduction.

The most individual and valuable feature of this edition is probably the fullness of the footnotes, which give an account not only of rejected forms but even of scribal corrections, and a fuller report than any edition since Zupitza's of the places where Thorkelin's transcripts are our sole authority for the text but differ between themselves. Professor Wrenn in his edition gives selected examples of Thorkelin readings; Professor Dobbie, drawing upon Professor Malone's facsimile edition and his important associated articles, records all the variations between the A and B transcripts where the manuscript is defective, and the numerous corrections to both of them. These notes, though sometimes more detailed than they need be, usefully remind readers how much we owe to the

Thorkelin copies. The lesson would have been even more effective if the readings that depend on the two transcripts in agreement could also have been distinguished, but that would doubtless have complicated the apparatus intolerably.

In constructing his text Mr. Dobbie avoids extremes of conservatism and innovation. In general he agrees closely with Klaeber's third edition, but he retains a few more manuscript readings, such as *hleorberan* 304, *heode* 404, *geþuren* 1285, and admits *ge[l]denne* 47 from Thorkelin. He rightly accepts Pope's excellent suggestion in ll. 2672-3:

laðra manna; ligyðum for.

Born bord wið rond, byrne ne meahte . . .

In minor emendations there is some inconsistency. Why alter *Heaporaemes* 519 to *-raemas*, and *hwile* 2710 to *hwila*, and yet keep *Headoscilfingas* 63 for the genitive, and similarly in ll. 2453 and 2921? Thorkelin's *weallinde* 2464 is changed to *weallende* on the ground that 'a present participle in *-inde* would be surprising in Beowulf'; but no more so than a genitive in *-ys*, in *wintrys* 516, which is retained. The parallel *feormynd* 2256 should be noticed; but there the note strangely says that this is 'for *feormiend*', as if the *y* were a spelling for *ie* though the *i* and the *e* belong to different syllables. If it is 'for' anything, it is *feormend* as in l. 2761.

The editor has not much to contribute to any of the great problems. The long note on ll. 305-6, for example, fails to face the difficulty that *gufmod* ought, by its form, to be a noun. The compounding problems in ll. 445 and 490 he meets in different ways, printing *mægen Hreðmanna* but *sigehreð secgum*. This is unconvincing. The structure of the phrases is so similar that they should surely be treated alike, and the best metre, and acceptable sense, is got from *mægenhreð manna* as from *sigehreð secgum*. In l. 1931 he prints *Mod Pryðo wæg*, noting but insufficiently appreciating Mr. Sisam's observations in this journal (xxii (1946), 266 n.), by which this reading ought to have been *onhohsnod* for good. In l. 2152 he prints *easforheafodsegn*, rendering it 'boar-head banner'; but is there any trace of such a thing? All the boar-images known or mentioned (except in purely decorative places like the ends of the eyebrows of the Sutton Hoo helmet) seem to be of the complete animal (like the Sutton Hoo stag), not the head alone.

Mr. Dobbie offers only one or two emendations of his own, of which the most interesting is *onfunde* for *mwatide* 2226 (already published in *M.L.N.*, lxvii (1952), 242-5). This might indeed fit the supposed original forms well enough, but it gives poor sense. The suggestion illustrates a disappointing feature of the edition. Its plausibility depends on the acceptance of Zupitza's view that f. 182 has been 'freshened up'. Mr. Dobbie notes Sedgefield's denial of this, but thinks that in the seventy years since Zupitza saw the manuscript its appearance may have changed. He adds, however, that Sedgefield's ultra-violet readings in his third edition 'deserve special confidence'. Yet he does not give them in full: e.g. at l. 2239 he notes Zupitza's report that the manuscript reads *rihde* 'freshened up from original *wende*', but not Sedgefield's reading *rende*, with the comment 'certainly not *rihde*, as Zu. says'. (Chambers could not 'share [Zupitza's] cer-

tain
rihd
info
posi
adm
223
gen
Sed
mwa
pres
atte
have
T
mer
edit
taile
for s
man
spell
the k
io si
he w
size
Beo
pleto
Jud
and
iden
late
shou
Mon
In
arran
we
Dr.
of da
up t
Som
cont
conf
able
it is
Late
note
wid;
wip

tainty as to the first hand', but expressed no doubt of *rihde*; Wrenn says 'MS *rihde* clear'. Thorkelin A and B both have *rihde*.) The present state of published information on this sadly ill-used folio is unsatisfactory. Sedgefield was very positive in denying 'freshening up', but to some extent contradicted himself by admitting that 'a later hand' had tampered with *wintra* 2209, *feal[h]* 2225, *ylcan* 2239. Chambers did not accept all Zupitza's readings, but did not question the general truth of his 'freshening up' theory. Wrenn (p. 12 of his edition) thinks Sedgefield 'probably right' in rejecting 'freshening up', but in his footnotes gives *mwatide* as 'apparently in "freshening up" hand'. A new edition such as the present, with its emphasis on textual matters, was the very place for a new attempt on this problem, and it is a great pity that Mr. Dobbie did not make, or have made, an independent examination of the disputed folio.

The Notes in general make wearisome reading, for they too often repeat the mere opinions of earlier editors, without sufficient discussion. The lists of editors who have favoured this or that reading could have been drastically curtailed, and the space more profitably used to give Mr. Dobbie's own grounds for selecting the form he prints. The Introduction gives a useful account of the manuscript, especially clear on the foliations. But the discussion of the *io* spellings (pp. xvii-xviii) is inadequate. Mr. Sisam has pointed out (*Studies in the History of OE. Literature*, pp. 92-93) that the first scribe was content to write *io* sixty-six times in fifty pages of *Alexander's Letter*, so that it cannot have been he who eliminated *io* from his part of *Beowulf*. It would be well, too, to emphasize that the cramping and the abnormal use of abbreviations on the last folio of *Beowulf* show that the scribe thought of *Beowulf* as a separate task, to be completed on that folio. It may have been some time before he went on to copy *Judith*. The section on content, background, and the like is agreeably concise and generally sound, but some judgements are hasty. It is not true that the identification of the *Eotan* with Hnæf's men 'hardly requires refutation at this late date' (p. 1). It still gives the best interpretation of l. 1141. On p. xxxv, note 6 should be brought up to date: there are three, not two, manuscripts of the *Liber Monstrorum*, and the spellings *Higlacus*, *Hyglaco* are of special importance.

In *Judith*, the most important textual point is the adoption at l. 287 of Kluge's arrangement (but with *nyde* instead of *nu*), to read *mid niðum neah gedrunen, þe we sculon nyde losian* as a lengthened line. This arrangement (also adopted by Dr. Timmer) is much better than the traditional one. Some of the notes are out of date. On *cohhetan* 270 Sweet is said to gloss the word 'cough (?)'. This is true up to the ninth edition of the *Reader*, but Dr. Onions has since given 'shout'. Something of this kind must certainly be meant, for 'cough' is absurd in the context and quite out of keeping with the variation *cirman hlude*. (Dr. Timmer's confidence in the poet's humorous intention carries no conviction.) It is probable, indeed, that *cozed* in *Gawain and the Green Knight* 307 has a similar sense: it is a crow rather than a cough that the character and the situation demand. Later editions of Sweet should also have been noticed at ll. 263 and 272b. The note on *wið hyre weard* 99 says that no other example occurs of this order with *wið*; but Bosworth-Toller quotes thirteen prose examples under *weard* adv. and *wiþ* ix, and there are others. In the Introduction (p. lxiv) metrical evidence—

mainly excess of alliteration—is held to favour dating *Judith* in the middle or late tenth century. But if it were contemporary with *Maldon*, we should expect a line like of *ðære ginnan byrig hyre togeanes gan* 149 to have only one, not two alliterating syllables in the second half, back and front *g* being kept separate. Apart from lines containing the name *Iudith* (13, 256), there is only one place where back and front *g* must alliterate (*ongeaton: grame* 238; Timmer (p. 8) is wrong about l. 22, for *y* in *gyte-* is a mutated vowel); but that one is decisive. If this is to be allowed any weight, it should imply a date earlier rather than later in the century.

This book, if unexciting, is serviceable, and clearly the fruit of great labour. Readers will congratulate Professor Dobbie on finishing so strongly the work he began as Krapp's assistant twenty-five years ago.

N. D.

The Life of St. Chad. Edited by RUDOLF VLEESKRUYER. Pp. viii+248. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1953. F. 15; 30s. net.

This book is welcome because Napier's edition of *St. Chad* (*Anglia*, x, 1888) is unobtainable, and because a fresh survey of the language in the light of more recent work on other Mercian texts was needed. Dr. Vleeskruyer has studied at both Amsterdam and Oxford; he knows the literature bearing on his subject; and he has had the advantage of access to Professor Harting's unpublished work on Werferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*.

The most interesting parts of a very full introduction deal with the sources, date, and vocabulary of the homily. The editor agrees with Napier that it is translated from a lost Latin sermon, based on Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, iv. 2, 3, and he shows that its beginning and end derive from Sulpicius Severus's *Life of St. Martin*. The homily is preserved in a twelfth-century Worcester manuscript (Bodl. MS. Hatton 116), and Napier thought it was translated not later than the first half of the tenth century. Dr. Vleeskruyer supposes it to be pre-Alfredian, but his arguments, both linguistic and palaeographical, are not decisive. He argues from *St. Chad*'s 'archaic' vocabulary: 'the rare *tylig*, *tylgest*', he says, 'which links *St. Chad* with the *Dialogues* and with the Corpus Glossary itself, goes far to prove, even without the support of other evidence, that the homily is a ninth-century production' (p. 68). He finds that the language of *St. Chad* agrees closely with that of the archetypal versions of the *Old English Bede* and the *Dialogues*, but that it is more archaic and poetic in its vocabulary, and therefore earlier. But it may be doubted whether the words he cites (p. 35), such as *preat* = *coetus* or *onseon* = *uultus*, would have seemed archaic or poetic to Mercians in the late ninth or early tenth century; or whether alliteration in prose is a mark of earliness (pp. 19 f.). His main palaeographical argument (pp. 69 f.)—that *ð* was used, perhaps to the exclusion of *þ*, in the original of *St. Chad*, and that this would date it between 850 and 900—is not well founded.

The editor's view that 'a vigorous tradition of Mercian vernacular writing preceded Alfred's work and, to a large extent, rendered it possible' must remain a conjecture. To deduce, as he does (p. 40 n.) from the words *an ærendgewrit*

of *La*
transl
ignor
centu
less l

Ab
which
harde
On th
from
spellin
him.

Saxon
it is s
versed
from
hlahen
not ag
think
Chad
show
compl

The
English
which
some
MS. h
the er
l. 121
printe

No
publish
that it
tions,
instanc
for the
that 'V
lands'
(p. 56)

Verses
Foll
12s.
The

of *Lædene on Englisc areccan*, in Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, 'that translating was one of the accomplishments of pre-Alfredian scholarship' is to ignore the context; Alfred maintains—and he was likely to know about ninth-century Mercians—that earlier scholars had not provided translations for the less learned.

About half the introduction is devoted to the sounds and inflexions of *St. Chad*, which are usefully compared with those of other Mercian texts. The editor's hardest task is to distinguish late forms and spellings from those of the original. On the questionable assumption that the Hatton scribe copied *St. Chad* direct from the original Mercian translation, all the West-Saxon and transitional spellings, such as *ea* before *ld*, *ea* for *æ* (Gmc. *ai+i*), *u* for *y*, are ascribed to him. At the same time certain Anglian forms appearing throughout the West-Saxon pieces he copied, such as *haldap*, *seolf*, are attributed to him also; and it is suggested (p. 10) that he was a West Midland scribe, 'exceptionally well-versed in late West-Saxon spelling usage'. Forms that distinguish *St. Chad* from the rest of the manuscript, such as prevalent *e* for *æ* (Gmc. *ai+i*) and *a* in *hlahendne*, *waxendum*, are held to derive from the original, whose dialect does not agree in these peculiarities with any extant Mercian text; yet Dr. Vleeskruyer thinks the homily was probably composed and translated at Lichfield, where Chad was buried. Should we conclude that none of our other Mercian texts show the Lichfield dialect, or is the mixture of forms in *St. Chad* due to a more complex textual history than Dr. Vleeskruyer supposes?

The text is printed conveniently alongside its Latin sources and the *Old English Bede*. Not all the fresh interpretations (e.g. of MS. *on orleahstre*, ll. 233 f., which Napier rightly emended to *ond orleahstre*) are acceptable; but there are some good emendations, for instance of MS. *mid micle* to *medmicle*, l. 8, and of MS. *heofugendlican* to *beofugendlican*, l. 175. The text is generally accurate, and the errors I have noticed are trivial: *woroldpingum* for *woruld-*, l. 84, *þa* for *pa*, l. 121 (the accent is part of the tail of *þ* in the line above); *megenþrymme* misprinted for *-þrymme*, l. 177.

No pains have been spared to make the apparatus full and helpful, and the publishers have done their part well. Perhaps the chief merit of this edition is that it provokes thought. It contains many valuable observations and suggestions, and Dr. Vleeskruyer is prepared to risk some unorthodox opinions: for instance, that the Kentish Charters 'are with few exceptions primary evidence for the state of Mercian prose in the early part of the ninth century' (p. 47); that 'West Mercian appears to have been the literary language of the East Midlands' (p. 25 n.); that none of the *Blickling Homilies* were composed after 900 (p. 56). This is an interesting and challenging book. CELIA SISAM

Verses of Cadence: An Introduction to the Prosody of Chaucer and his Followers. By JAMES G. SOUTHWORTH. Pp. 94. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. 12s. 6d. net.

The problem of Chaucerian prosody is trebly awkward. English prosody in

general has few agreed principles and an historically confused nomenclature. We do not know for certain some of the finer points of pronunciation of Chaucer's English, in particular how far final *-e*, representing an earlier fuller inflexion, was pronounced in ordinary speech and in verse. And Chaucer was an innovator—how great an innovator is part of the problem. In reading Chaucer's later verse (which is all Mr. Southworth concerns himself with) the problem presents itself thus: hundreds of lines scan *as if* (rhyme apart) the basic pattern, the 'tune' in Chaucer's mind, was something fairly close to the pattern underlying, say, good Elizabethan blank verse; a pattern which, it may be argued, was later exquisitely refined and regularized by Pope and others. But hundreds of lines of Chaucer's verse do not seem at all close to this pattern, including the very line which begins *The Canterbury Tales*.

Mr. Southworth starts from a dissatisfaction in particular with final *-e* at the end of the line, and states that the rules for pronouncing it within the line are inconsistent. Probably most readers of today will sympathize with this and with his rejection of the iambic foot as a basis for examining Chaucer's metrical practice. His further rejection of the single line as a basis of measurement also deserves consideration.

Mr. Southworth hardly turns this initial sympathy to account. He has provided no orderly exposition of his views and although he makes some good points here and there his assumptions, methods, and conclusions are very questionable. The most useful part of his book is the convincing attack he makes on the methods by which earlier scholars arrived at what he calls the 'myth' of the pronunciation of final *-e*, especially at the end of the line. But he does not meet the problem raised by such rhymes as *Rome: to me* (*General Prologue*, 671-2), shrugging it off, without references, as Chaucer's humour.

In this slender book there are only seventeen pages fully devoted to Chaucer's own writing, which is examined in unemended manuscripts, though elsewhere scholars who rely too heavily on scribal spellings are rightly reprobated. But when Mr. Southworth says that the movement of Chaucer's verse, apart from being the same as his prose or anyone else's prose of the time which has the merit of 'modern rhythm' (p. 38), is also like that of *Piers Plowman*, *Sir Gawain*, Gower's verse, and contemporary speech (p. 91), the reader may feel that even seventeen pages are too many, and that a specifically Chaucerian prosody, or even prosody itself, is, as Mr. Southworth would say, 'a myth'. Or he may feel that the fundamental problem of prosody, which is to discover the nature and possible variations of patterns of sound, has never been envisaged. Of course one assumes that Chaucer's general speech-feeling was that of his own time. Mr. Southworth assumes a roughly decasyllabic basis for Chaucer's line (not that he allows syllable-counting) and allows every variety of stress. This is to beg the question. There is no general survey, no statement of premisses, no solid structure of facts, no adequate discussion of Chaucer's own few comments—except to attribute to him the phrase 'verses of cadence' which he did not use. Style and presentation in general leave much to be desired.

D. S. BREWER

The

Pp

19

T

succ

auth

de B

Man

them

chur

exam

the t

tion

Latin

very

story

manu

Frenc

repr

le Dar

sourc

of the

that J

redac

could

versio

over,

was t

prob

piling

and f

nexion

from a

nect th

Of t

the ma

to be t

was w

the cas

eviden

the cad

has sm

still co

On t

Bourgo

a good

The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville. By JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT. Pp. viii+436. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. \$6.70; 52s. net.

This is an important book, though the title perhaps promises more than it succeeds in fulfilling. It is essentially a study of the problems connected with the authorship of the *Travels*, and of its attribution, by different scholars, to Jean de Bourgogne, otherwise John *ad barbam*, to Jean d'Outremeuse, or to Sir John Mandeville himself. Previous writers on the subject have in the main confined themselves to the evidence provided in the *Travels*, the alleged epitaph in the church of the Guillemins, and that offered by Jean d'Outremeuse. Mrs. Bennett examines carefully all this evidence, and in addition shows how a close study of the texts of the different versions will throw light on the question. A consideration of the relationship between the *Myreur* of Jean d'Outremeuse and the Vulgate Latin version of the *Travels* leads to the conclusion that there must have been a very close connexion between the author of the *Myreur* and the author of the story of Mandeville's two meetings with Jean de Bourgogne. Again, the French manuscripts of the *Travels* fall naturally into three distinct families, the Norman-French, a Paris redaction, and a so-called Ogier redaction. The last of these, best represented in the Chantilly MS., contains interpolations dealing with Ogier le Danois, such as occur also in the Latin Vulgate version, of which it is in fact the source. The Norman-French version appears to represent most faithfully the work of the author, while the Paris redaction comes between the two. It seems certain that Jean d'Outremeuse was responsible for the Ogier redaction, and that it is a redaction and not the original version. But it is quite clear that the same author could not have been responsible for both the Ogier and the Norman-French version, since they differ in dialect, literary quality, style, and method. Moreover, a consideration of the date of composition suggests 1356, and d'Outremeuse was too young at that date to have written so mature and learned a work. In all probability he came upon a copy of the *Travels* in the 1380's, when he was compiling his *Trésorier*, and he is no doubt responsible for the Ogier interpolations, and for the Latin version of the *Travels* which includes them. As for the connexion of Jean de Bourgogne with the *Travels*, the only evidence for this comes from a thoroughly discredited witness, and there is in fact nothing at all to connect the composition of the work with Liège.

Of the three versions the best is undoubtedly the Norman-French one. Since the manuscripts containing it are usually written in English hands, and are still to be found almost exclusively in England, this would suggest that the original was written in this country. In the text itself there are a few hints that this was the case, but they are too slight to be of much value by themselves. The clearest evidence on the subject lies in the style of the Norman-French version, in which the cadence and word-order are more English than French. The Paris redactor has smoothed it out a little, but he did not rewrite, and the Englishman's French still comes through in his version.

On the whole Mrs. Bennett shows conclusively enough that neither Jean de Bourgogne nor Jean d'Outremeuse can have been the author, and makes out a good case for the composition of the *Travels* in England. But the evidence for

the authorship of a Sir John Mandeville is a very different matter. Contemporary records show more than one of that name, and from them it would be possible enough to construct a tentative biography of a Sir John Mandeville, born and educated at St. Albans, who went abroad in 1322. But, as Mrs. Bennett points out, although 'such a weaving together of records would make a coherent and plausible story . . . the truth is that we do not know, and probably never will know, whether these records concern one man or several men named John Mandeville—or whether any of them are actually records of the man who wrote the *Travels*'.

Although this second part dealing with the authorship is perhaps the most important part of the book it is far from being the whole if it. The first part gives an excellent account of the literary virtues of the *Travels*; it surveys the sources, and emphasizes the artistry of the author's use of them. The imaginative additions are dealt with, and the question of whether the author himself travelled at all is answered by the probability that he knew something of the near East from original observation. A third part considers briefly the reputation and influence of the *Travels*, not only on its contemporaries but on the discoverers and explorers of the New World, and on writers such as More, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, and others.

Altogether this is a notable contribution to our knowledge of an important and influential work, with its careful marshalling of the evidence, and the author's first-hand knowledge of the manuscripts. Future students will be particularly grateful for the appendixes, containing as they do an excellent account of the extant manuscripts, as well as a list of editions. The production is generally excellent, and misprints are few. Mrs. Bennett has more than succeeded in her declared object of 'clearing away the debris of misinformation and misunderstanding which has been accumulating around both the book and its author for six centuries'.

R. M. WILSON

Tamburlaine's Malady and Other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama. By JOHNSTONE PARR. Pp. xiv + 158. Tuscaloosa: Alabama University Press, 1953. \$3.50.

Editors' comments on astrological allusions in older texts are apt to be so vague or obscure as to tell the reader no more than he has already guessed. Professor Parr has done a useful job in illustrating fully, from the pseudo-scientific writings current at the time, nine passages in Elizabethan drama, with explanations of the techniques and terms involved.

His most fruitful essay defines the catastrophe in 2 *Tamburlaine* as the hero's death from a distemper caused by inordinate passion—ambition, wrath, revenge. The heavens have given him a self-destructive success. The precise astro-physiology of the physician (v. iii. 78 ff.) translates into clinical terms the rhetoric of earlier prophecies: 'Dry up with anger and consume with heat' (iv. i. 181; cf. 140-3). This view is a suggestive departure from recent discussions of the idea

of his
lxix (the fo
Some
its gr
James
fact (i
to uni
noted
but a
Folge
1600-
suing
calam
date L
own '
simila
lines c
Satur
chiron
new-b
Unfor
last. A
would
This
Allen's
The p
The c
subject
catalog
formul
means
being
taught
'allotte
interpr
his 'sh
revival
which
aberrat
shortha
ment,
sixteen
thinkin
experie
the role

of history in Marlowe (e.g. I. Ribner, *E.L.H.*, xx (1953), 251-66; cf. *P.M.L.A.*, lxix (1954), 591-609); clearly, to see the play as simple glorification of *virtù* or of the *fortunatus* is to blur the counterpoint of 'smiling stars' and 'meteors of blood'. Somewhat similar is the case of the proud Duke of Byron, whose horoscope with its grim *Caput Algol* forms the pivotal scene of *Byron's Conspiracy* (III. iii). In *James IV*, I. i the horoscope dishonestly misinterpreted by the quack Ateukin in fact (rightly construed) describes the King's character and destiny as the play is to unfold them. Of Shakespeare's longest piece of astrology, *King Lear*, I. ii, it is noted that the theme is, not eclipses (thus the play need not follow those of 1605), but a *read* prediction of their 'sequent effects'; and Dr. Parr has found in the Folger Library one of the pamphlets issued in those prognostic-ridden years 1600-5—Himbert de Billy's *Certaine Wonderful Predictions for seven yeeres ensuing* (1604, ? for 1603). It is not, of course, a 'source', but it includes the same calamities as Edmund's sheet. This evidence supports the present tendency to date *Lear* 1604-5 (cf. K. Muir's edn., xxii ff.). Edmund's scepticism about his own 'nativity under Ursa Major' is shown to be unwarranted; and there are similar demonstrations of the technical accuracy of Mycetes's horoscope (opening lines of I *Tamb.*), Lyly's planetary allegory in *The Woman in the Moon* (but Saturn is given 'the passions of the heart' instead of Mars and Sol), Subtle's chiromancy, &c. (*Alchemist*, I. iii), and the horoscope of the Duchess of Malfy's new-born son (II. ii; unfulfilled, however, and impossible for 'Dec. 19, 1504'!). Unfortunately there is no serious attempt to explain the artistic purpose of this last. A reference to Miss M. C. Bradbrook's article (*M.L.R.*, xlii (1947), 281 ff.) would be helpful.

This book is deliberately limited in scope—it does not compete with D. C. Allen's *The Star-crossed Renaissance* (1941); but even so it has defects in method. The preface tells us that 'reams of sheer data' were omitted; too many were not. The chapter headed 'Shakespeare's artistic use of astrology' fails to touch its subject because like all such catalogues it ignores the intrinsically *ad hoc*, uncataloguable quality of poetic images. The learned account of Faustus's conjuring formulas gives no hint of their dramatic point, the blasphemy which of itself means the presence of Hell and Hell's ministers. Dr. Parr here runs the risk of being as naïve as Dr. Faustus who, obsessed with 'magical' phrases, has to be taught their true nature, and who, as he shows by his dying cry that Hell has been 'allotted' by the stars that reigned at his nativity, tragically never learns it. The interpreter of literature, however modest, must surely take note of attitudes to his 'sheer data', as defined by context. The Perkins-Harvey controversy and its revivals (Bacon, Donne, &c.) were but one symptom of the seriousness with which men were, variously, exercised by notions that 'may now be considered aberrations of the human mind'. The symbolism of astrology was not a simple shorthand for which the poets might have substituted any other mode of statement, but a protean *topos* that focused, in many varying senses, the great sixteenth-century commonplaces (the pressures that made urgent the age's thinking): permanence in mutability, time and fortune, nature and grace, personal experience and universal values, self and cosmos. Also relevant for the critic is the role of astrology (as Jung suggests) in keeping open a bridge to a deeper sense

of life's rootedness in time and the structure of the universe. Dr. Parr's results would gain from a firmer setting—including for comparison material from the prose fiction and pamphlets.

But the minutiae of professional astrology force on us another question. It is always tempting for the scholar, dusty from his researches, to assure us: 'The Elizabethan audience would at once recognize . . . ' Would it? Prognostications often so alike and the spherical-chesslike intricacy of the permutations in horoscopy can never have provided a precise grammar of response for the theatre. Dramatists writing with Claudius Dario or Augier Ferrier at their elbow can scarcely have expected the spectator to have it all in his head. This is not Dr. Parr's verdict, but the evidence he so meticulously leads compels it. Shakespeare significantly, in his 'more than a hundred separate astrological allusions', never assumes or exhibits expert knowledge. So a modern playwright might freely use words like 'neurosis' or 'inhibition' without invoking psychiatric theory or procedure.

Future workers will be well served by the very full list of astrological textbooks (1473-1625) and by the bibliographical guide. The book has minor misprints.

J. C. BRYCE

King Henry V. Edited by J. H. WALTER. Pp. xlviii + 167 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General Editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1954. 15s. net.

The New Arden edition of *Henry V* seems to me, in the main, a serviceable piece of work, though it suffers from the lack of coherent policy which becomes increasingly marked with the appearance of each volume.

In the Introduction, Mr. Walter deals briefly with the play's date (happily a matter about which there seems no doubt) and its sources, but concerns himself mainly with the orientation of Henry in relation to 1, 2 *Henry IV* (including, of course, Falstaff) and renaissance views on kingship. The least satisfactory section here is No. 10, on the nature of the Quarto and Folio texts, which seems confused both in its use of evidence and its conclusion that the Folio copy was transcript with autograph additions. Mr. Walter argues, for instance, that the international episode of III. ii was an addition since 'it includes oaths which would not have escaped the eye of the Master of Revels unless the passage had been added after he gave his licence to act' (p. xli); but the same argument would hold good for the Crispian speech, which was certainly written before the 1606 Act since it appears in Q (1600). Another piece of evidence which contributes to his belief in revision (resulting, he argues, in confusion of the time scheme for IV. i) seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the text. The Chorus to Act IV has promised a night scene and puts the time as 3 a.m. Hence Henry's 'good morrow' (since it is after midnight) at IV. i. 3, 13. But it is still dark when Henry fobs off Erpingham (IV. i. 29-32) so that he is left alone and can carry out his real design. When he encounters Bates, Court, and Williams (IV. i. 85-86) day is beginning to break, but it is not yet light: Bates speaks of 'as cold a night as 'tis' at l. 115, and it is

necessarily still dark when Henry and Williams exchange gages (cf. iv. vii. 130, iv. viii. 52-53). Hence 'tomorrow' at iv. i. 220, 234 means the very day then breaking (i.e. the next day from the standpoint of that night). In the same way, in *M. for M.*, iv. ii, 'tomorrow' means the coming day whether the expression is used before, at, or after midnight (cf. also the close of *1 Henry IV*, ii. iv). In the meantime, the lords have been summoned to Henry's tent (in accordance with iv. i. 24-27) and, finding him absent, have anxiously set out in search of him. He is found by Erpingham, who thus provides a resting-point between Henry's soliloquy on Ceremony and his prayer, and Erpingham's recognition of the king presupposes that day has dawned. Hence the 'tomorrow' of the dialogue with Williams becomes the 'today' of Henry's prayer. Far from being confused, the time scheme is carefully plotted and is linked with the preceding scene in the French camp, which closes at 2 a.m., and the following French scene, which opens after the sun is up. This section of the Introduction should be read with the greatest caution.

The modernization of the text seems to me, in the main, sensible and systematic, though there are a few oddities, like 'eche' for 'eke' (III. Ch. 35), and some inconsistencies in the rendering of Fluellen's tricks of speech: 'doo's' is preserved, but not his characteristic 'ha's'. It is also difficult to see why the disagreeable 'makes such' at i. ii. 28 is retained but not the euphonious 'thinks thou' at iv. i. 259. In emendation Mr. Walter is orthodox, though he rejects three long-established readings, introducing 'here' at ii. i. 36 (F 'hewne', Hanmer 'drawn'), 'prived' at ii. iv. 107 (F 'priuy', Q 'pining') and 'conjure' at iii. i. 7 (F 'commune', Rowe 'summon'). At ii. iv. 107 my own preference is still for Q, and 'conjure' at iii. i. 7 strikes me as less stirring than 'summon'. But an editor does well to challenge traditional readings which he conceives to be wrong, and it is certainly difficult to see how Compositor A, responsible for 'commune', chanced to make the type of blunder Rowe's emendation presupposes. It is a different matter with Compositor B's 'hewne' at ii. i. 36, which Mr. Walter suggests was a misreading. This is the more plausible if the manuscript spelling was 'heare' (as in *S.T.M.*), and the emendation draws some support from Q. But between Compositor B's propensity to ravel the matter and the quondam Quickly's, an editor is between the devil and the deep sea. Very few of B's errors in *Henry V* are, in fact, misreadings. What Shakespeare wrote at ii. i. 36 may, therefore, be anyone's guess.

Mr. Walter falls a little, I think, into the now common fallacy of supposing that misreading was the commonest type of printing-house error. Had this been the case, there ought to have been far fewer errors in reprints than there often are. Setting aside the special difficulties of foreign words and names, well under half the emendations that have been traditionally made in *Henry V* presuppose misreading of copy, and it would have been entirely in accordance with what the readings usually emended suggest (as well as in line with the emendations Mr. Walter has himself approved) if the metre had been regularized at iv. iii. 128 (following Theobald), at V. Ch. 29 (following Seymour and the Cambridge editors), and if the superior Q readings had been followed at ii. ii. 105 ('black from white') and at iv. vi. 15 ('dear cousin Suffolk'). Interpolations, omissions,

and errors of repetition and anticipation are, in the consensus of opinion, far more numerous in *Henry V* than errors due to misreading, though F's 'find' at I. ii. 72 should, I feel, be included among errors of the latter kind. Q's 'fine', meaning both 'to complete' and 'to purify' (whence the mention of 'pure truth' in the next line) and glancing at 'fine' the legal term for a fictitious or collusive conveyance, surely gives better sense. Consequently, 'convey'd' in l. 74 has a legal significance and is not simply a euphemism for 'steal'.

In general, the New Arden explanatory notes strike me as better suited to present-day needs than its predecessor's, though I regret the loss of some of the Old Arden's judicious glosses. Evans's explanation of 'fin'd', in another sense, at IV. vii. 71 was accurate, whereas 'staked', 'wagered' (Walter) suggests a bow drawn at a venture. It is also difficult to see why 'borne' (sustained) is explained at I. ii. 212 but the technical terms in music and archery at I. ii. 180-3, 186 are not, or why 'dial' at I. ii. 210 is glossed but 'sad' (grave) and 'surly' (stern) at I. ii. 202 are passed over in silence.

There are three appendixes: the first contains extracts from Holinshed, 1587; the second a note on the gift of tennis balls; and the third the wooing scene from *The Famous Victories*.

A few errors in the text itself should be corrected: 'And' (Q) for 'For' at I. ii. 30, 'at' omitted at II. ii. 163 and 'brother' at IV. i. 3, and 'are all' for 'all are' at IV. iii. 4. The semicolon at the end of II. ii. 23 should be deleted.

To pick on details may seem like cavilling. What I am getting at is the lack of coherent policy behind these New Arden texts and their explanatory matter. Do editors consider whether there is any principle underlying the emendations they accept and those they reject? Do they use Onions's excellent and handy Glossary for guidance or assurance? Many texts will have their own problems (especially as regards collation notes), but some general principles could surely be worked out to put the separate volumes and the edition as a whole on an even keel—and I harp on these two needs (for a coherent policy in emendation and a stress on semantics in annotation) because twentieth-century work on transmission problems and the *O.E.D.* suggest the lines along which significant advances in the editing of Shakespeare should be made.

ALICE WALKER

The Young Shakespeare. By E. B. EVERITT. Pp. 188 (Anglistica, Vol. II). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. Kr. 27.50; 32s.

In brief, the evolution which Professor Everitt proposes for the young Shakespeare is that on leaving Stratford he became a law clerk, in which occupation he practised the craft of penmanship; and becoming thereafter interested in literature and the drama, he taught himself French and Italian and began in about 1587 to write plays. Until 1589 he was associated with the Queen's Men, whom he left to join Pembroke's, and in 1592 he began his long association with Strange's. By 1592, when Greene spoke of him in envious derision as *Johannes factotum*, he

had written the following works: *The Famous Victories of Henry V*; *The Chronicle History of Leir*; *Edmund Ironside*; an early version of *Pericles*; *The Troublesome Reign of King John*; *Titus Andronicus*, though not in any form in which we have it today; the *Ur-Hamlet*; *The Taming of a Shrew*; *Tarleton's News out of Purgatory* (a collection of stories mostly paraphrased from the Italian); the three Parts of *Henry VI*; and possibly, though it may have been a little later, 'Addition D' to *Sir Thomas More*. He was, therefore, one of the *noverint* writers whose literary aspirations were so displeasing to Nashe that he ridiculed them not only in his Epistle to Greene's *Menaphon* but in two of his own pamphlets.

These attributions, or some of them, rest upon Shakespeare's handwriting. The only handwriting commonly accepted as Shakespeare's consists of six signatures, the earliest of which is dated 1612, and from a microscopic examination of this slender evidence Mr. Everitt has been able to conclude that Shakespeare wrote the hand of a professional penman. This is a convenient starting-point for any conjectural journey, since it was required of a professional penman that he should be able to exhibit a certain virtuosity in his craft and be master of several different styles of writing. Mr. Everitt finds that Shakespeare employed eight different styles—his handwriting, in fact, had the same elusive impersonality as some critics find in his dramatic style. From this conclusion he has no difficulty in proceeding to identify as Shakespeare's manuscripts written in seemingly different hands, and Mr. Everitt offers as specimens of his penmanship the text of *Edmund Ironside*, a letter written to Alleyn in 1587, 'Addition D' to *Sir Thomas More*, and the script of Middleton's *Second Maiden's Tragedy*. (This last was written in 1611, for Shakespeare's responsibilities as his company's principal dramatist did not interfere with his continued practice of his original profession.)

These graphological discoveries are really the foundation of Mr. Everitt's whole argument. Shakespeare, like Kyd, was a *noverint*. Therefore he was involved in the 'battle of the pamphlets' which raged between 1589 and 1592, was, indeed, the chief butt of the University wits in their dislike of the semi-educated actors and law clerks who aspired to be translators and poets. From allusions which he detects in these polemics to works which he is therefore obliged to identify as Shakespeare's, Mr. Everitt is led to the conclusion that such plays as *The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Troublesome Reign* were not source plays or bad quartos, but original works which Shakespeare substantially revised in his maturity. Being thus persuaded that Shakespeare was an energetic reviser (he will not allow that either *The Contention* or *The True Tragedy* is a bad quarto), he credits the young Shakespeare with early, imperfect versions of any of his plays of which earlier titles are known to have existed: whence the appearance in the list of such pieces as *The Famous Victories*, *Leir*, and the *Ur-Hamlet*. This summary of his contentions is oversimplified, but it is not unfair to them: the argument simply proceeds in a circle, and before he is done, Mr. Everitt is able to persuade himself that all twenty-one of the points into which he divides the Epistle to *Menaphon* might, and probably do, refer to Shakespeare.

Mr. Everitt does, however, buttress his arguments with a formidable array of internal evidences. He is not content to rely on the handwriting 'tests' alone, and in fact much the most interesting and persuasive part of his book is the long

section in which he sets out resemblances between *Edmund Ironside* and plays that are commonly acknowledged to be Shakespearean. Shakespeare's trick of repeating certain patterns of imagery is so well known that if we were to find in an anonymous manuscript of, say, 1588 the famous 'spaniel' cluster, should we not strongly suspect that Shakespeare had at least a hand in the play? Another such powerful and recurrent image is that which associated a certain type of distracted grief with the sufferings of Hecuba. It coloured a whole scene in *Hamlet*, and it appeared again in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*. In *Edmund Ironside* Emma, a distraught mother of a sort not uncommon in the early plays, exclaims:

To dam my eyes were but to drown my heart
Like Hecuba, the woeful queen of Troy,
Who, having no avoidance for her grief,
Ran mad for sorrow 'cause she could not weep.

(It might be added that the compressed, apparently mixed, metaphor in the first line is very Shakespearean.) Though none is quite so striking, Mr. Everitt furnishes a number of parallels of this kind.

Many a tall man had been now alive;
Many a salt tear had been now unshed
By fathers for their sons' unhappy deaths,
By mothers for their children's wretched ends,
And widows for their husbands' timeless want

has a Shakespearean cadence. Again, at the news of the defeat of one of his armies, Canutus says:

This unwelcome news
Nips like a hoary frost our springing hopes,
And makes my fearful soldiers hang their heads.

Mr. Everitt justifiably argues that these lines, and the whole context in which they appear, recall the passage in which Salisbury informs Richard II of the desertion of the Welsh. Indeed, his thorough and patient examination of the play, to which a summary cannot do justice, brings him, by way of resemblances in diction, vocabulary, imagery, ethical and political thought, similar treatment of similar situations, and so forth, to an impressive statement in favour of Shakespeare's authorship.

In suggesting that Shakespeare probably began to write for the theatre before 1591, the earliest date conjectured by Chambers; in connecting him with the Queen's Men in their later days; and in thinking that Pembroke's Men were active in London much earlier than the winter of 1592, when they first appear in the records, Mr. Everitt is in line with powerful tendencies in present-day criticism. But it is another matter when he finds Shakespeare to have been a conscientious improver of his early work, or credits him with plays that are not in the Folio. Here he is dangerously retrogressive, for he is releasing hares that have been safely run to ground. On revision, admittedly, there is no proof, but those who believe in it must bring evidence to show that stylistic revision (as against necessary alterations to accommodate changes in the company) was ever a practice of the

Eliza
of hi
spear
Wh
ing b
pause
scrup
gets t
no sig
the dr
to set
good:
appea
rival c
in any
even th
Even a
stock
dramat
Shakes
spaniel
of it, it
he was
though
of these
likewis
There
the very
nettle.
to go to
fellow-a
plays be
genius,
difficulty

Shakesp

Lawre

The in
a careful
from the
Samuel C
unweede
of Marce
Barnabe

Elizabethan theatre; and they must also persuade us that the extensive reworking of his earlier plays was a habit that is likely to have been congenial to Shakespeare's particular genius.

When it comes to proving authorship, parallels and resemblances make beguiling but treacherous arguments. Often in the course of his expositions Mr. Everitt pauses to remark, 'If this isn't Shakespeare, it is a remarkably skilful and unscrupulous plagiarist.' Like all his kind, from the Baconians upwards, he forgets that plagiarism was so common in Elizabethan literature that the word has no significance. The briefest examination of the Elizabethan sonnet will show that the dramatists were not the only writers who carried tables on which it was meet to set down whatever took their fancy. To be in the fashion was in itself to be good: originality commanded no respect. In the theatre the play that most appealed to the actors was one which had already been played with success by a rival company, and dramatists were positively encouraged to imitate. Moreover, in any drama there are certain stock situations that must recur, and the reaction, even the verbal response, of the characters to these situations will not widely vary. Even at a deeper level, are we to believe that there were not also stock images for stock situations? Identifying an image as strictly personal to one individual dramatist is a risky business. To take again the most celebrated instance of all, Shakespeare is unlikely to have been the only Elizabethan writer to associate spaniels with flattery; however much he made it his own in his later development of it, it need not have been his image in the first place. If we remember too that he was an actor, whose art it was to absorb into his own personality the words and thoughts that other men had written for him, we should not be surprised if some of these words and thoughts were reproduced in his own plays; and his thoughts, likewise, in the plays of other men.

There remains the First Folio. Mr. Everitt is aware of it, though it is not until the very last page of the book that he stretches out an uneasy hand to grasp the nettle. We know what Heminges and Condell said in their Preface, but we have to go to Mr. Everitt to discover what they meant by what they said: 'The two fellow-actors, Heminge and Condell, collected and chose just those thirty-six plays best calculated to display impressively the highest plane of his dramatic genius, which was no doubt their purpose.' Well, that is one way round the difficulty.

M. M. REESE

Shakespeare's Derived Imagery. By JOHN ERSKINE HANKINS. Pp. viii+289. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1953. \$5.00.

The interpretation of this book lies in the application of the word *because*. It is a careful study of the basis in commonplace of twenty of Shakespeare's images, from the extended and familiar Seven Ages of Man (upon which Professor Samuel Chew has already expended his erudition) to the more personal one of the unweeded garden. The basis for study is a Latin schoolbook, the *Zodiacus Vitae* of Marcellus Palingenius, which was translated between 1560 and 1565 by Barnabe Googe. It is described as 'a compendium in verse of astronomical,

moral, and philosophic thought, with different points of view put into the mouths of different speakers'—one of those collections of accepted ideas by which the sixteenth century maintained continuity with the immediate past even where the framework of belief had been broken.

It is not surprising that most of the ideas to be found in the *Zodiacus Vitae* are also to be found in Shakespeare's works. If he had read it as diligently as he did North's Plutarch, it would probably be obligatory upon students of Shakespeare to do so too, and the scholarly reprint of Miss Rosemond Tuve might have to appear in a popular edition. But in spite of the large number of parallels which Dr. Hankins cites, this cannot be assumed. What is commonplace circulates, and can be met everywhere; the images common to Shakespeare and Palingenius were the small change of Elizabethan thought. The 'brief candle' of the emblem writers, the worm-devoured corpse of memorial sculptors, and the Zodiac of the theatrical Heavens were familiar visually as well as verbally. The significance of Palingenius lies in this. Never man's thought better kept the highway. As Dr. Hankins shrewdly observes (p. 5), 'We must emphasize the point that detection of specific sources is not the most important part of scholarly criticism.' He decides none the less that the *Zodiake* 'was probably a contributory source of all these commonplaces, provided we can assume Shakespeare was familiar with the book'. A cautious hypothesis, which, if accepted, does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that even unusual images 'were recalled from the *Zodiake* rather than from any other source'. Dr. Hankins notes the correspondences between the *Zodiake* and *The French Academy* of Pierre de la Primaudaye, and concludes (p. 17) that the latter had 'supplemented the *Zodiake* in a number of instances'. Here he has begged the question.

It can be safely concluded that the images found in Palingenius were fed back into Shakespeare's mind, and Middleton's mind (where, on reading his works for another purpose, I happened to find a good many quite casually), and the minds of the audience, by a constant repetition and use. Palingenius is of interest as a dictionary of accepted ideas, and is a 'source' in the same sense that a dictionary is a 'source' of a writer using that language. The twenty images which Dr. Hankins has studied are illuminating, and provided the reader clings firmly to his own conception of *because*, they provide some measure of the easiness and facility with which Shakespeare selected from the diction of common life the appropriate material for his very uncommon creative talents.

M. C. BRADBROOK

Honourable Entertainments. By THOMAS MIDDLETON. 1621. Prepared for the Malone Society by R. C. BALD. Pp. xvi+ [57]. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1953.

The Captives. By THOMAS HEYWOOD. Prepared for the Malone Society by ARTHUR BROWN. Pp. xviii+127. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1953.

It is always a pleasure to record a new publication by the Malone Society and

the t
text v
impo
Mi
ably
copy
brief
1912,
short
Jones
writte
self-e
Readi
Th
(like t
the cu
drama
lated
rested
Cokay
'after
expres
Levity
Season
'Flow
is the
The
title in
Mr. B
script
positio
alterat
from t
to The
eviden
record
Captiv
wood
MS. E
extract
Mr. B
and en
wood s
blunde
no evide
bert's l

the two most recent volumes have the special interest of introducing a Middleton text which has not hitherto been reprinted and a play of Heywood's which is of importance as a specimen of 'foul papers'.

Middleton's *Honourable Entertainments*, 1621 (an octavo printed by Eld, probably for private circulation), is here reprinted for the first time from the unique copy in the Huntington Library. In the Introduction, Professor Bald gives a brief history of the book from 1886, when its existence was first announced, to 1912, when it was acquired for the Huntington Library. This is followed by a short account of the two Lord Mayors (Sir William Cokayne and Sir Francis Jones) during whose terms of office (1619-20, 1620-1) these ten pieces were written, brief comments on the occasions for which those pieces which are not self-explanatory were intended, and the customary list of Irregular and Doubtful Readings.

The pieces are short: the longest is under 200 lines. Some are solo speeches (like the Water Nymph's congratulations on the Mayor and Aldermen's reviving the custom of visiting the springs and conduit heads, No. 3). Others are quasi-dramatic, often with songs interspersed. But whatever their form, all were calculated to gratify civic pride and encourage civic virtues, and their appeal plainly rested on the novelty of their *mise en scène* and properties—as when the passing of Cokayne's term of office was lamented by one 'attir'd like a Mourner' who entered 'after a made Dish like a Herse, stuck with sable Bannerets, Drums and Trumpets expressing a mournfull Seruice'. The lighter pieces, like the spirited bout between Levity and Sobriety in No. 7, seem to me the most attractive and the Song of the Seasons in No. 8 contains an interesting list of popular names of flowers. Autumn's 'Flower of Chrystall' may give Middleton's editors something to think about; and is the 'Ruffling Robin' an older name for the ragged robin?

Thomas Heywood's *The Captives*, a play preserved without author's name or title in MS. Egerton 1994, is well known, even notorious. In his Introduction, Mr. Brown sets out the evidence which leads to the conclusion that the manuscript was autograph, with alterations made by the author in the course of composition and subsequently, in a second ink, when he read it through. Later alterations and additions, in another ink and different hand, can be postulated from their character as a book-keeper's or prompter's. The play was attributed to Thomas Heywood by Bullen, its first editor, on literary grounds and on the evidence of an entry in Herbert's office book, dated 3 September 1624, which records the licensing 'For the Cockpit Company' of 'A new Play, called, The Captive, or The Lost recovered: Written by Hayward'. The attribution to Heywood was strengthened in an article by Sir Walter Greg on the next play in MS. Egerton 1994 (*Calisto* or *The Escapes of Jupiter*) in the same handwriting and extracted, with revisions, from Heywood's *The Golden Age* and *The Silver Age*. Mr. Brown gives a summary of this article (*Anglica, Palaestra*, vol. cxlviii, 1925) and endorses its conclusions, with further observations on the three known Heywood signatures and the way in which *The Captives* sheds light on printing-house blunders in Heywood's *The Exemplary Lives*. He agrees too that, since there is no evidence that the surviving manuscript of *The Captives* passed through Herbert's hands, what the Egerton MS. preserves is author's foul papers, revised by

a book-keeper or prompter, preparatory to the preparation of a scribal fair copy which could be submitted for licence and used in the theatre.

There is, then, no doubt about the authorship of the play or the character of the manuscript. What is gravely in doubt is the transliteration of Heywood's foul hand. He would seem to have been in control of almost everything except his pen. He clearly wrote with ease; and his spelling, though individual, is systematic as manuscript spelling goes; he had an orderly mind and took trouble over act and scene divisions, speech prefixes, and stage directions; and he was provided with enough clean paper to see him through the job. But the four facsimiles which accompany the text make abundantly clear what patience, resourcefulness and inspiration Mr. Brown and Mr. R. E. Alton, who checked the edition, must have needed. As Mr. Brown explains in his Introduction, though what word was meant may often be caught from the context, it is far from clear whether all the customary minims are there or not, or even what spelling was sometimes intended; and from the footnotes I judge that the number of blots and Heywood's habit of touching up letters have added to the difficulties. What is surprising is the lack of any discernible system of punctuation, and one wonders what Mr. Brown's fellow-sufferer, the scribe who copied the manuscript for Herbert's perusal, had done about the matter when he encountered, midway through the play, the Lord de Avene's admonition to his Lady: 'Insert in Copinge no suspicious dash or doubt-ffull Coma.' Of the suspicious dash, Heywood was not guilty; but doubtful commas and doubtful periods abound.

ALICE WALKER

The Complete Prose Works of John Milton. Volume I, 1624-42. Edited by DON M. WOLFE. Pp. xviii+1073. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. 82s. net.

This massive volume, the first of eight, is an interesting product of the New Model scholarship of North America. The last comprehensive English edition of Milton's prose was that in the Bohn Library (1848-53): earlier editors, from John Toland in 1698 to Mitford in 1851, had gathered in almost all the Latin and English works or remains; but, while usually providing a biography, they had not attempted full annotation or explanation. Their assumption was in the tradition of humane letters: that anyone who concerned himself with these rebarbative works would have the equipment to make a beginning and could go further with the aid of other historical, theological, or literary works available.

The *Complete Prose Works of John Milton* reveals how much more difficult things are for the modern student, if we may deduce his difficulties from the help offered him; and how all attempts to make things easier seem but to make them more difficult still. The editors acknowledge the value of the Columbia edition (1931-8), even if it did no more than 'establish the text, both Latin and English, as a basis for future scholarship' (p. viii). The Columbia editors included some material which had not been printed for more than a hundred years, but they provided no preface or notes, and arranged the prose in a confusing order. The

present edition is to give 'annotated texts of Milton's prose in the ascertainable order of its composition, bringing to bear in notes, prefaces, and volume introductions the accumulated scholarship of the past century' (p. ix). The Latin works will be presented in translation—'to save space for annotation'. Doubtful works will be treated in appendixes. Every scrap written by Milton (except in verse) will therefore be gathered into this mass, and garnished with all the information, or references to the information, deemed necessary to its interpretation.

And what an amount that turns out to be! Milton having enriched his mind with those stores of learning of which we all form a general, if humble, impression, and his prose making most extensive use of that learning, it is to be expected that all the explanations which may be required by modern readers will be great in quantity and difficulty. Only sharp critical intelligence, stern economy, and a capacity for clear discrimination and decision could keep such a task of annotation and commentary within reasonable limits. Such qualities might have been found in an individual scholar; it seems impossible that they should ever take effect through the 'co-operative scholarship' which is the basis of this edition. The nine editors of the 'international and inter-university board', which is in charge, assert in the Preface that they 'are convinced anew of the rich rewards, both personal and intellectual, of co-operative scholarship' (p. ix). At least twenty scholars have been concerned in the production of this first volume, and no doubt it is a notable achievement to have brought together their joint learning, and organized their contributions. Such methods can, of course, produce in a few years an accumulation of special and detailed knowledge which the lifetime of an individual would hardly suffice to gather. But a lack of focus and an uncertainty of judgement (with all the spreading intellectual confusion which may result from them) are the inevitable price of the method. Numberless examples might be given of irrelevance and garrulity in notes and comments. It will be enough to cite the footnote of three pages attached to Milton's Fifth Prolusion (pp. 261-4). The Third Prolusion is a fierce attack on Scholastic philosophy, to whose decaying discipline Milton was subjected at Cambridge. The next two Prolusions show him engaging, competently enough, in some of those barren scholastic exercises which he hated and scorned. The editors fancy it possible that the student of Milton (presumably in his capacity as a student of Milton) might wish to pursue an investigation of scholasticism, and provide their three-page footnote to guide his reading of Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, M. Étienne Gilson, and others less eminent. They add: 'In connection with the topics which Milton discusses in these exercises, one should recall that Bacon too touched upon them in the *Novum Organum*, II, i ff. For comment on Bacon's treatment of form in connection with Aristotle's four causes, see *Francis Bacon: Essays, Advancement of Learning, New Atlantis, and Other Pieces*, ed. R. F. Jones (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1937), pp. xxiii ff., and Fowler, *Novum Organum*, pp. 54 ff.' (p. 263).

The welter of detail and superfluous reference may be allowed to do little harm in the notes and brief introductions to each work. The error is an excess of zeal, magnified by a complex machine, an overshooting of the mark in what is at least the right direction. The worst results of 'co-operative scholarship' are to be traced, more indirectly, elsewhere, when synthesis and critical judgement must

be attempted. The 200-page Introduction to this volume by the Editor, Professor Don M. Wolfe (who is also General Editor of the edition), bears unmistakable marks of its ambience. It would be unfair to attribute Mr. Wolfe's dense prose style to the practice of co-operative scholarship: its qualities are not uncommon in other contexts. But his habit of mind and his methods seem characteristic of an atmosphere in which individual knowledge and judgement are eagerly acknowledged, only to be practically nullified by a democratic equation in which they must meet dozens of other individual minds and judgements. Mr. Wolfe's purpose is to give both a picture of the political, social, and religious conditions of 1628-42, and an account of Milton's intervention in the controversies unleashed by the Long Parliament in 1640. The Introduction is made up of sixteen short chapters, each composed of several subdivisions. The course of the narrative, if course it can be said to have, is constantly interrupted by these changes of topic, and by detailed quotation and description, whether in an account of the trial and execution of Strafford (not accompanied by any explanation of his position and past), or in a summary of 'a remarkable statement issued in May [1641] by twenty or thirty former apprentices, titled *A Short and True Relation Concerning the Soap-Business*' (p. 92).

What does Mr. Wolfe's Introduction in fact add to what we may find in Masson? He gives prominence to the social and economic changes which were taking place, or had taken place, in the first half of the seventeenth century. And this no doubt is the chief modification introduced, since Masson wrote, into our view of the Puritan movement. Other 'modern' notes are repeated references to the Puritans' aversion to sensuous beauty and pleasure, and repeated reminders of the part played by Puritanism in the development of English, and more particularly American, democracy. But these points, simple as they are, barely emerge from the lumpy conglomeration which Mr. Wolfe offers. Is it not in fact plain that a full account and revaluation of the events of the time could not possibly be made, even by an expert historian, within the limits of 200 pages? Is not Milton's part in public controversy a matter with its own separate, and sufficient, interest? And would it not have been wiser and simpler to present all that we need try to know about the events of those years through the account of Milton's pamphlets and of Milton's position? This would at least have provided what Henry James would have called a 'compositional clue'. But it would have required the adoption of a definite, if restricted, point of view, thus running the risk of excluding what somebody else might have thought relevant or significant. Mr. Wolfe might even have had to choose between a Marxist and a 'liberal' view of history.

Milton remains. The flight of the eagle is unhindered by the rest of the flock. This edition will have its own very considerable value, in which the chronological arrangement will be prominent. It will be no small gain to have displayed in order the documents of Milton's extraordinary career and development between *Lycidas* and *Paradise Lost*. The student with his wits about him will know how to use the encyclopaedic side of the edition, and much that is useless, or worse, will probably sink under its own weight.

F. T. PRINCE

Jon
L
A
mar
whi
gath
the
chie
and
rath
wor
ton
bold
writ
T
has
thor
itsel
acco
use
ackn
of S
shou
part
that
seri
Lon
Mis
Fau
S
Con
the
the
A c
stru
whi
Wh
Lud
evid
193
cial
in e
171
sug
Tub

Jonathan Swift: A Critical Biography. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. Pp. 508. London: Jonathan Cape, 1954. 30s. net.

A good many books have been written about Swift since Lord Orrery's *Remarks* appeared in 1752. Some have offered little more than a sketch in black and white, some a more formal portrait study, based on the letters and material gathered from early memoirs, which indeed offer a great plenty to the moralist, the historian, the politician or the psychologist. Many have occupied themselves chiefly with the riddles of this strange personality or the romantic story of Stella and Vanessa. Because of this, recent students of Swift have turned their attention rather to his writings, to study this master of satire at work, in the belief that the work of the critic should be distinct from the work of the biographer. Mr. Middleton Murry will have none of this. He calls his book *A Critical Biography* and boldly claims in his preface that he has set out with the definite intention of writing 'at once a life of Swift and a critical study of his works'.

This is no light task, even if we consider merely the amount of material which has to be dealt with; but he has carried it through without haste, with considerable thoroughness, and with an independence of judgement which has never allowed itself to be subjected to the power of Swift's dominating personality. In his account of Swift's political activities in England and Ireland he has made good use of the work of recent historians and editors, to whom he makes generous acknowledgement. In his criticism of individual works he shows a fine perception of Swift's qualities as a writer. It is particularly interesting, for example, that he should regard *A Letter of Advice to a Young Poet* as 'an unsatisfactory piece', parts of which 'read like clever imitations of Swift by somebody else', because that is, I believe, exactly what they are. At any rate its authenticity must be seriously questioned, because although it was printed in Dublin and reprinted in London with Swift's name on the title-page in 1721, it was not included in the *Miscellanies* of Pope and Swift, or in the collected edition of his work printed by Faulkner in his lifetime.

Sometimes accepted opinions are challenged on the value of such works as *The Conduct of the Allies* or *Polite Conversation*, and more emphasis has been given to the study of the few documents which remain from the years which Swift spent in the household of Sir William Temple, before he began work on *A Tale of a Tub*. A careful analysis of the early poems forms the basis of a convincing account of the struggles of Swift to find some outlet for the power within him and of the crisis which led him to break away from the enchantment of the Muse and turn to satire. Whether or not we share Mr. Murry's certainty that *A Description of Mother Ludwell's Cave* was written by Swift, it cannot be lightly dismissed in view of the evidence he has added to the arguments set forth by Professor Moore Smith in 1930 in his edition of *The Early Essays and Romances of William Temple*, especially the misquotation of Horace in the manuscript of the poem which occurs in exactly the same form afterwards in a letter of Swift's to Atterbury of 3 August 1713. The Muse's Cave is referred to in the *Lines to Congreve* and it is a pleasant suggestion that 'the famous Troglodyte philosopher' mentioned in *A Tale of a Tub* should be interpreted with this in mind:

The ardent poetic votary, who sought in the Cave the footsteps of Druids and the inspiration of the innocent Muse, is changed into the cave-dwelling philosopher. . . .

The other documents of this early period which are reinterpreted are the letters to Varina. Most of Swift's biographers have been inclined to take them less seriously and to doubt whether he had been much disturbed by her refusal of his offer of marriage. Now, though we really know nothing of the affair until it is almost over, we are asked to believe on the evidence of that one curious letter, written at the end of April 1696, just before Swift left Ireland to return to Temple, that he had fallen passionately in love with her and 'ardently desired to marry her'. Moreover, we are to discover here in his humiliation at her refusal the real cause of his unwillingness ever to think of marriage again:

His disillusion and determination never to expose himself again, and the armour of cynicism in which he now took up the adventure of ambition, together determined the nature of his response to her. . . . If we want the answer to the eternal question: Why did he not marry Stella? we do not have to seek it in fantastic theories, . . . It was because of his rejection by Varina.

This is certainly a simple explanation; but in view of the fact that only two letters to Varina survive, and in the light of his other remarks about this lady, it cannot be more than a daring conjecture. A biographer may well feel obliged to offer explanations in order to make his story hold together, and again when the evidence is conflicting he is forced to make a decision. Thus we are asked also to accept the story of a secret marriage with Stella, performed by a bishop, illegally, without witnesses, in a garden, and never consummated nor acknowledged, not on the grounds that it was accepted by most of Swift's biographers in the eighteenth century but because, if it had not happened, the final break with Vanessa is inexplicable; and we are expected to believe that Stella insisted on this empty formality, this 'mockery of Christian marriage', in order to remove her fear of his marrying Vanessa.

But what is most disturbing about a book that has some admirable qualities is that it elaborates further that romantic horror story that persists from Thackeray to Aldous Huxley and D. H. Lawrence, with the theme that Swift was 'driven into a frenzy of foulness by his contemplation of woman as a physical reality'. It is curious to observe what emotional outbursts Swift can produce from his critics.

One listens to it with a kind of hateful fascination, as it were to the drooling of genius, or the chant of one of his own Bedlamite academy while he dabbles in his excrement.

It would not matter so much if it had not left its mark on the criticism of *Gulliver's Travels*. Mr. Murry writes admirably of the pattern of Gulliver, but when he goes on to discuss the 'personal equation' there is a mingling of criticism and biography which seems to me to show how dangerous the mixture can be; for he is so concerned to recognize and analyse certain parts of it as samples of Swift's malady that he sometimes overlooks two elements in him which his contemporaries were always aware of, because he had been long known to them as 'Bickerstaff' and 'Dean'. They evidently enjoyed all the fun and jokes at the expense of

the
The
Dr.
writ
cop
des
cha

I
may
my
Mal

T
cier
mor
the
tion
In a
four
and
furt
poll
diffi
prea
of f
dan
mat
of t
inde
his
tion
S
that
edit
tend
amu
taste
befo
extr
alm
has

1
(195

the popular travellers' tales, and were amused rather than vexed by his *Travels*. They were not filled with horror, they were delighted; if we may judge from Dr. Arbuthnot's early comment: 'Gulliver is a happy man that at his age can write such a merry work.' They would have appreciated his reply to the charge of coprophily, which he put in the second chapter of the first book, where having described in considerable detail his sanitary arrangements when he was a prisoner chained up in the ancient Temple of Lilliput, he adds the following apology:

I would not have dwelt so long upon a Circumstance, that perhaps at first sight may appear not very momentous, if I had not thought it necessary to justify my Character in Point of Cleanliness to the World; which I am told, some of my Maligners have been pleased, upon this and other Occasions, to call in Question.

The other element which Mr. Murry does not seem to me to recognize sufficiently here and elsewhere is that which belongs to the tradition of Christian morality, which Swift accepted. To his early readers neither his misanthropy nor the images in which he expressed it seemed necessarily due to a diseased imagination, for they were familiar with both in their reading of the Bible and of sermons. In a recent article¹ Mr. R. M. Frye has pointed out that John Wesley quotes the fourth book of Gulliver for his own purposes in his *Doctrine of Original Sin* (1757) and has no difficulty in understanding its traditional symbolism. And he notes further that the very diet of the Yahoos, as specified by Gulliver, consists of those polluted meats that are proscribed according to the Levitical code. He has no difficulty in gathering heaps of instances from the Fathers and from English preachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to parallel Swift's symbols of filth and deformity. It is Mr. Murry or his method that has produced so dangerous a 'personal equation' in *Gulliver's Travels*; and he does not mend matters by saying that 'the repulsive and shocking elements in Swift's conception of the Yahoo should not invalidate or weaken his satire on human society'. If indeed 'in the last resort . . . his vision lacks integrity', then the whole power of his satire is lost; for we should rightly feel that we could not trust the observations of one whose mind was polluted.

Swift's reputation in his own day suffered because of many unsavoury pieces that were attributed to him by the booksellers; and after his death the activity of editors who printed all sorts of trivialities in prose and verse, which he never intended for publication. In periods of deafness and illness in his last years he amused himself in odd ways, and perhaps there are few whose sympathy and tastes are wide enough not to be occasionally offended. There are incidents too before the final collapse which cannot be contemplated without pain; and the extremities of physical suffering are an ugly sight. But, even if true, it seems almost a breach of decorum to set it down that 'the final impression is of one who has been radically infected by the corruption he universally discovers'.

HERBERT DAVIS

¹ 'Swift's Yahoo and the Christian Symbols for Sin', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, xv (1954), 201-17.

The Text of Gulliver's Travels. By SIR HAROLD WILLIAMS. Pp. vii+94 (Sandars Lectures in Bibliography 1950). Cambridge: University Press, 1952. 21s. net.

'Gulliver vexeth me more than any'—so Swift remarked to his friend Charles Ford in 1733 when Faulkner, the Dublin printer, was preparing a new edition of his *Works*. The remark deserves the fame it has since achieved: as Sir Harold Williams points out, vexation and controversy still attend both the text and interpretation of *Gulliver*. Swift himself was referring to the mangled text printed by Motte in 1726 and his difficulty in securing (since the manuscript was not available) a corrected text for Faulkner to follow in printing the new edition. 'Had there been only omissions', Swift complained to Ford, 'I should not care one farthing; but change of Style, new things foisted in, that are false facts, and I know not what, is very provoking. . . Besides, the whole Sting is taken out in severall passages, in order to soften them. Thus the Style is debased, the humor quite lost, and the matter insipid.' These words, and similar ones in other letters, indicate Swift's determination that Faulkner should present to the public and posterity a responsible printing of *Gulliver*. It is to the problem of how Swift wished *Gulliver* to survive, the problem of a proper copy-text for a modern edition, that Sir Harold Williams addresses himself in the Sandars Lectures in Bibliography 1950, here published.

These lectures originated in controversy, a controversy fully set forth by Sir Harold and, in my opinion, settled by his scholarly and meticulous arguments even though minor perplexities admittedly remain. The conclusion is that the best copy-text of *Gulliver*, despite certain deficiencies, is that printed by Faulkner in 1735 as Volume III of the *Works*. This view in fact had prevailed with more recent editors until it was challenged by the late Professor Arthur E. Case, who, argued for a more eclectic text based on Motte's edition of 1726 emended by Ford's corrections from the original manuscript as embodied in a list and an interleaved copy of *Gulliver* (now in the Forster Collection). In his critical edition of *Gulliver* (1938) and more elaborately in his *Four Essays on 'Gulliver's Travels'* (1945) Professor Case contended that 'the text of 1726 as amended by Ford's careful comparison with the original manuscript . . . is universally agreed to be as close as is humanly possible to the book its author intended it to be at the close of a six-year period of inspired creation and detailed revision'. To this statement Sir Harold gives qualified assent. He grants further that 'the additional changes of Faulkner's edition were an afterthought, and his text is a revision'. But here the two scholars part company. Professor Case indicted the 1735 Faulkner as a 'composite and relatively untrustworthy piece of editing', whereas Sir Harold contends that it is generally sound and more reliable, embodying as it does restored readings from the original manuscript and, particularly, Swift's own final revisions and intentions.

It is, in fact, the part Swift played in Faulkner's edition which is the crux of the controversy. Professor Case was sceptical that Swift read proof for Faulkner or seriously took the responsibility of revision and correction—this despite Faulkner's claims and other evidence, which Swift scholars now accept. Sir Harold therefore examines at length the evidence of Swift's participation, not only

in re
the
alm
Wor
with
of th
text
evid
ner's
Volu
Pr
judic
fund
the n
that
auth
can r
of G
vol. x
its ti
gener

The
Tr
Cu
Th
those
This
uncer
that S
misse
impos
John
of Mr
Lond
Such
indica
theory
some
ledge
Mr.
period
career

in revising and correcting the text of *Gulliver* but also in revising and correcting the text of his own printed set of the *Miscellanies* of 1727-32, which Faulkner almost certainly used as a copy-text for the other three volumes of the collected *Works*. Swift's own copy of the *Miscellanies* (now in Lord Rothschild's Library), with corrections in his own hand adopted by Faulkner, becomes an integral part of the argument: *Gulliver*, as Sir Harold views the matter, is not an independent textual problem but part of an entire set undergoing revision. In view of the clear evidence of Swift's interest in the first, second, and fourth volumes of Faulkner's *Works*, it is hardly disputable that he would show even more interest in Volume III containing *Gulliver*, whose earlier printing had so chagrined him.

Professor Case's challenging contentions are examined keenly, courteously, judiciously. His important contributions are admitted at the same time that the fundamental weakness in his position is exposed. Here one can merely mention the mass of detail which Sir Harold has marshalled with cogency to demonstrate that Swift worked with Faulkner and that the Faulkner edition represents the author's revisions and final intentions. The controversy has been useful: we can now rest in the conviction that there is a sound basis for the recent editions of *Gulliver*, as in the Nonesuch *Swift* (1934) and the Shakespeare Head *Swift*, vol. xi (1941). We must, indeed, see in Sir Harold's book an importance beyond its title and apparent scope in that it affirms the principles and procedures generally followed in the Shakespeare Head edition of Swift as a whole.

LOUIS A. LANDA

The Artificial Bastard. A Biography of Richard Savage. By CLARENCE TRACY. Pp. xvii+164. Toronto: University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$4.50; 36s. net.

The title of this authoritative study seems to suggest that Mr. Tracy sides with those who have denied Savage's claims to be the illegitimate son of Earl Rivers. This is not the case, since the author prefers, like Boswell, to 'vibrate in a state of uncertainty', and even shows a slight bias in Savage's favour. He certainly proves that Savage was a man of good upbringing and some education, not to be dismissed as an unscrupulous liar; and if he was an impostor he at least succeeded in imposing on Bessy Savage, Countess of Rochford (Rivers's genuine bastard), on John Savage (the successor to the Rivers title), and on Lord Tyrconnel (nephew of Mrs. Brett, the putative mother). Mrs. Brett in 1731 'alone of all the people in London who were in any way concerned with him, denied his claim' (p. 93). Such facts as there are, however, about the birth and fostering of Mrs. Brett's son indicate a plot more complicated than that of *The Confidential Clerk*. The old theory that Savage was an unwitting impostor, substituted for the dead son by some interested party and groomed for stardom, is in our present state of knowledge as credible as any.

Mr. Tracy is surely right to emphasize one point of sociological interest: in his period Savage suffered little if at all from the stigma of his birth, and started his career with an advantage over many a commoner born in wedlock. Given the

romantic story of his origin, his charm, conversational ability, and literary talent, Savage could not fail to be a success in the fluid society of the time. His eventual sufferings were wholly the result of his impossible temperament. His career closely resembles Eustace Budgell's, and both illustrate what happened when you broke a basic law for literary men: you could not insult a noble lord unless you had powerful backing or financial independence.

Mr. Tracy is admirable on Savage's politics, his important relationship with Pope and with various Dunces, and on the social scene. His work will not be superseded for many years. Such criticisms as can be made arise not from Mr. Tracy's knowledge and thoroughness but from the nature of the work itself. Such a book can hardly be anything but an improved version of Hill's notes on Johnson's great *Account*. Mr. Tracy does not attempt what is now called literary criticism; and it is doubtful if there is very much to be said about Savage's verse, apart from explaining its biographical and topical references. This Mr. Tracy does extremely well, and it is to be hoped that his edition of Savage will be published in the near future. Beyond correcting Johnson's inaccuracies and filling in his gaps, Savage's biographer can do little; unless he takes on the difficult task of testing and deepening Johnson's astonishing insights into Savage's strange character. Here, I think, Mr. Tracy has failed. Rather than rely on his own knowledge of human nature, he quotes the standard half-baked analysis of an American psychiatrist, who, as Mr. Tracy admits, has but cast a perfunctory eye on the *Account*. This deference to the card-index, and the desire to mention everything that has been written about Savage, are weaknesses, but not serious ones, in an excellent book.

M. J. C. HODGART

Blake: Prophet Against Empire. By DAVID V. ERDMAN. Pp. xx+503. Princeton: University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. \$7.50; £2. 8s. net.

Professor Erdman's 'historical approach' to Blake starts with the historical poems in *Poetical Sketches*, in which he finds more than hints from the American War of Independence. Blake's medieval studies in Plantagenet monuments and in such authors as Rapiin made him compare Edward III's aggression against France and its sequel, the Black Death, with George III's war against his colonies and the metaphorical plagues which would or did follow. If, as Mr. Erdman thinks, the second scene of *King Edward the Third* refers covertly and unfavourably to the arming of privateers against France when she attacked Britain in 1778, then Blake went further than most of the many Englishmen who sympathized with the American cause. But I think that Mr. Erdman is here on thin ice, and on even thinner when he connects the 'Glad Day' drawing (1780) with the Gordon riots of that year. What he does show clearly is that Blake was no youthful jingo, as some have thought, or glorifier of war. He was, however, attempting drama, and that, surely, means exhibiting a diversity of character and opinion.

Mr. Erdman soon reaches firmer ground. His exposition of *An Island in the Moon* as based on Blake's own circle of friends (in 1784) is much the most convincing that has appeared. If some identifications are still tentative, his main thesis here is unlikely to be superseded. Next, he plausibly connects *Tiriel* (usually dated 1788) with George III's attack of madness in that year, and he is at his very happiest with *The French Revolution, America, Europe, and Visions of the Daughters of Albion*. In the first three of these there has never been any doubt about the politics, but Mr. Erdman not only gives new and certain explanations of many passages but exhibits a coherence which, at any rate in *America and Europe*, has not been so clear before. His explanation of the slavery background to *Visions of the Daughters of Albion* and its connexion with the engravings Blake did for Stedman's *Narrative* is brilliant. He has also many interesting suggestions about *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, though I cannot accept his political exposition of its 'Argument'. And I am very far from being able to accept 'The Tyger' as a 'great revolutionary lyric'.

With *The Four Zoas* he is handicapped by the absence of a scientific text. The editions are verbally accurate but do not give adequate information about the changes made in the manuscript. He argues for three 'layers', one before, one during, and one after the Amiens Peace interval. 'In *The French Revolution and America and Europe* [Blake] had dealt with recent events. In *The Four Zoas* he allowed his tune to be called by events unfolding as he wrote. The result is as mad as the effort to play croquet in Wonderland with living mallets and balls.' Mr. Erdman's guesses about which ball is which seem to me sometimes probable (e.g. that the war in the 'earlier' Night VII is the 1799 Anglo-Russian campaign in Holland) and sometimes possible (e.g. that George III is glanced at, or more than glanced at, in the lament of 'Urizen the King' in Night V), but it is his exposition of Night VIII as Blake's cry of despair at the renewal of war and as written in London after his return from Felpham which is most satisfying. The significance of this Night and its place in Blake's life are definitely established.

About *Milton* he makes some tentative suggestions of more contemporary political reference than has hitherto been apparent, but he is more helpful with *Jerusalem*. 'The contemporary frame of reference is the latter part of the war, the years of Napoleon's decline and fall and the triumph of British and German arms, when the problem is not simply to dissuade Albion from fighting but to oppose his making a conqueror's peace'; but 'Jerusalem must be built . . . the poet and his inspiration are furiously weaving the fibres of affection from man to man to counteract the destructive work of "the Mills of Satan and Beelzeboul"'. Here again some of Mr. Erdman's elucidations seem firmer-based than others: here too one wonders how far one must modify one's view of Blake's character: and here too one is sometimes disturbed by a clash between one's own bias in favour of one's own country and Mr. Erdman's very naturally different bias. These three questions concern the whole book.

The last may be exemplified by the Tate Gallery picture *The Spiritual Form of Nelson guiding Leviathan*. Mr. Erdman sees it almost as a crypto-cartoon. Nelson is one of war's 'heroic villains' (Blake's *Annotations* to Bacon, 1798,

supplies the phrase). The chained negro at the foot of the picture represents 'slavery at the base of British naval power; but in 1807 the slave trade had been legally abolished, and [so the negro is] resting in the surf of the shore (of freedom) though his hands remain manacled (to the continuing institution of slavery)'. The figure in Leviathan's mouth 'is Christ, crowned with thorns but . . . still fighting War's false gods'. I think it improbable that Blake, who pinned hopes to his 1809 Exhibition, was not chiefly concerned here with the 'heroic' side of this Happy Warrior. I see the haloed Nelson (with two arms and two eyes, unlike his corporeal form) defying, like Ajax, the lightnings of the elements and the enemy. The black figure at his feet represents the victory of the Nile, and Mr. Erdman's Christ (who has no stigmata and a wreath not necessarily thorny) I take to represent some other victory, perhaps Copenhagen.

The second question concerns Blake's character. Was he fundamentally such an ardent 'red' and republican that he ought to have sacrificed all by speaking out? Mr. Erdman thinks his enthusiasm for the French Revolution survived Robespierre and that his disillusion with its course was not complete till the Consulate of 1799. Yet his publications ceased in 1795, the year of the whiff of grapeshot. My own reading of Blake in this respect is more like my reading of Wordsworth, that politics were liable to lead him astray from his true vocation and that the instinct of poet-preservation was sound. Wordsworth was glad he had been preserved as a poet instead of staying in Paris to be guillotined. Blake was in no danger of that, but, if he had been foolish enough, he might have gone to Botany Bay. What a subject for the imagination!

Finally, how much do Mr. Erdman's long shots which miss, or perhaps miss, the target affect the value of his book? His history seems to me to be good, though there are some slips of which a confusion of the 1801 and the 1807 Copenhagen affairs is the most serious. His 'historical approach' thoroughly justifies itself. It is most fruitful. Passage after passage is cleared up, and the substitution of historical reference for will-o'-the-wisp pursuit of mythological consistency is often most convincing and satisfying. The book has its self-imposed limitations. Not much more than the 'social reference' of *Innocence and Experience* is Mr. Erdman's concern. Blake's eagerness to 'open the Eternal Worlds' is not his affair. But Blake 'in this world' is, and his great industry, learning, and insight have taken him far beyond any predecessor in this field. None of my doubts and disagreements have prevented me from finding this book most illuminating. It is and will remain a landmark in Blake studies.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

The Publication of Landor's Works. By R. H. SUPER. Pp. xi+125. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1954. Available only to members of the Bibliographical Society.

Nobody in search of amusement should be deterred by the title of this book. It is not merely another useful bibliography, a recension of Wheeler and Wise, the immense utility of whose work is in no way impugned. It is an entertainingly

lively account of the way Landor's books were published, an account which amounts almost to a biography, or at least detailed character sketch of the choleric lion, whose rage against his publishers is equalled only by their despair of him. It is significant that Mr. Super can say at the end of his Introduction: 'The arrangement is by publishers, but that is in general the same as a chronological arrangement.' In the early days the trouble arose from 'the ignorance of the business, the willingness to weigh the casual advice of a friend against the calculations of the publishers, the lofty amateurish tone, and the usual difficulty of meeting his accounts'. Then there was his habit of sending in almost illegible corrections and additions—usually at the last moment; then the deletions of his publishers because of libellous remarks or scandalous words, together with a class contempt of these mere servants (an attitude he did not, however, attempt to maintain with Murray).

To begin with there were Cadell & Davies, 'probably London's leading publishers' in 1795, who negotiated Landor's first *Poems*. Some thirty-six copies were sold, and Landor owed £35. The firm rejected *Gebir*, which was undertaken by Sharpe of Warwick, Landor not bothering to correct the proofs. Then other people began to take charge, to begin with Robert Landor, who helped with Slatter and Munday (it was they who acted as agents for Shelley's *Necessity of Atheism*); then there was Meyler of Bath; then Darton of London, and Valpy of London, and then John Murray. But by now Southey was the intermediary, to be followed by Lady Blessington, Browning, Julius Hare, and the self-effacing Forster—though even his patience was in the end exhausted. In the meantime the publishers were Colburn, Nistri of Pisa, someone unknown, Taylor & Hessey—who deleted copiously, to Landor's fury—Southey being again in charge, the pitch being somewhat queered by Hazlitt; Henry Colburn again, James Duncan, Moxon, Leigh Hunt in the *Monthly Repository*, and Saunders & Otley. Then, helped by Lady Blessington, attempts in America which came to nothing, then more English publishers, Wertheimer & Co., Richard Bentley, followed by many others, Reynell & Weight, Chapman & Hall, Bradbury & Evans, then at last in America, Ticknor & Fields of Boston. Then back to Bath, to Edinburgh, to London again with Holyoake, back to Italy with Barbera of Florence, and Newby in London.

It is an amazing story, punctuated by Landor, in his most irate mood, swearing he would never write another word, and throwing all his manuscripts in the fire; and it is all most entertainingly told by Mr. Super, not through any comments of his own, but by putting before us the relevant correspondence. We do not, admittedly, get a full picture of Landor, but only Landor at his most tempestuous, violently contradicting his statement that he strove with none—though he did indeed think that none were worth his strife. The whole is carefully documented, with a good many citations from unpublished sources, the necessary comments being woven into a continuous narrative which never flags because it is never otiose. This is not to say that side-lights are screened off, and we get, for instance, information about Landor's generosity to Capern, the 'Poet and Day-laborer at Bideford, Devon' who was also a postman, by a gift which was not so ridiculous as is usually supposed. There is also, by the way, a good deal of

acute literary criticism. In short, this is a publication no Landorian should miss; and though here and there no doubt, as Mr. Super suggests, certain points need amplifying or clarifying, it will be of enormous interest to students of publishing during the period covered.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

Poetic Process. By GEORGE WHALLEY. Pp. xl+256. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953. 21s. net.

This is a difficult book to read, partly because of the intrinsic difficulty of the subject-matter but partly also, it must be said, because of the author's style and procedure of writing. Mr. Whalley tells us in his Introduction that this is a Coleridgean book, and indeed it has grown out of work on Coleridge's thought that Mr. Whalley still pursues. Its philosophical temper is very much in that tradition to which Coleridge owed his main allegiance, the German Idealist school of the nineteenth century. These are deep and even troubled waters and their confluence with the turbulent currents of more modern thought such as Existentialism and *Gestalt* psychology makes it a difficult passage in places for the reader. Needless to say, the tradition in which Mr. Whalley writes will make his book unpopular in many quarters in this country where empiricism and positivism still reign supreme. Even when one expresses sympathy with Mr. Whalley's presuppositions and approach one must admit that a greater regard for logical analysis and the strict insistence upon exactness of terminology that characterizes contemporary philosophy would have made for greater clarity in his essay.

From Coleridge's theory of imagination Mr. Whalley develops a doctrine of what he calls 'symbolic extrication'. To use his own words, 'Poetry realizes, bodies forth, incarnates experience of a special kind. This experience I have called "paradeigmatic" because it is self-evident and bears within itself a recognition of intrinsic value. The recognition of value is also a grasp of reality carrying with it the conviction of genuine knowing; this knowing is pre-logical and requires no external tests to establish itself.' Poetry does this by manifesting itself in a system of symbols which are self-determining and, to use Coleridge's phrase, 'consubstantial with the truth of which they are the conductors'. Mr. Whalley goes on in later chapters to apply this doctrine to a discussion of such subjects as Metaphor, Symbol and Myth, Music and Rhythm. Here it seems to me he is at his best. He is a sensitive critic with good taste and in the individual passages that he scrutinizes we are given an excellent account of how poetry 'works'. His Note on Allegory is illuminating and admirable. But such critical passages seem to owe little to the theoretical framework in which he sets them.

Mr. Whalley, to do him justice, would probably disclaim any intention of erecting such a theoretical framework. He tells us that his inquiry is not meant to be 'an analysis of propositions or statements about art, but an inquiry into certain kinds of experience'. Here he commands our sympathy. Too much critical writing perhaps has been carried out at a distance from the text itself. But it is too disarming to continue, 'To suppose that the subject could be

exhausted by a succession of propositions, and that the worth of the inquiry could be determined by the logical correlation of those propositions, was an assumption that I could not accept.' Doubtless there is no substitute for poetry, no logical contrivance that will penetrate its inner mystery and exhaust its meaning. But even so, writing *about* art must be propositional and must conform to the rules of logic. Criticism no doubt is an inadequate substitute for art itself, but that is no reason why it should seek to usurp its functions. Whether he likes it or not, Mr. Whalley is writing philosophy and philosophy (whether it be philosophy of art or any other sort) is propositional and depends for its cogency upon logical consistency.

Behind this question of method lies a basic problem which Mr. Whalley indicates but never really solves. Poetry, he affirms, has some sort of traffic in knowledge, but what sort of knowledge this is and what relation it has to the rest of our knowledge are questions that go unanswered. It is true that Mr. Whalley indicates some sort of answer when he says, 'The value of poetry derives from its origin in reality and not from any conceptual or symbolic structure outside itself; it rests upon a primitive mode of apprehension and a prelogical mode of knowing. Intellectual activity interpenetrates the prelogical mode to criticize the process of poetic embodiment; but intellect is not the poet's sovereign faculty. Poetic process is characteristically perceptual and physical, a matter of feeling rather than of thought or ideas.' But what relation, if any, this poetic knowledge has to the knowledge which derives from our conceptual powers is still left vague. For Coleridge even perception depended upon the higher reaches of the mind. Knowledge for him was unified; the imagination fructifying the reason and the reason in turn being engaged by means of the imagination in the simplest act of perception. Mr. Whalley writes acutely of the difference between Coleridge's and Kant's account of this matter, but his insistence that Kant's 'intellectual synthesis' established the dominance of the understanding in a manner unacceptable to Coleridge can be overdone. For Coleridge the imagination was undoubtedly 'the agent of the Reason', and though there were differences between their views they were not upon this point. Moreover, Mr. Whalley's comments upon Kant are entirely restricted to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where Kant is not concerned with art. In the *Critique of Judgment*, to which Mr. Whalley does not refer, there is a much more promising philosophy of art, which, though it may differ in important respects from Coleridge's, does so on grounds other than those Mr. Whalley indicates.

The above remarks have perhaps seized on those points which strike one as least convincingly sustained in the book, but this must not detract from the very real merit it possesses. Its author is widely read, sensitive, and concerned with the really important questions in poetic. He will stimulate and provoke inquiry even when he does not command assent.

R. L. BRETT

The Disinherited of Art. By SOLOMON FISHMAN. Pp. xiii + 178. Berkeley, California: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1953. 21s. net.

The title of Dr. Fishman's work is well chosen. In Henry James's story the phrase represents, not the author's point of view, but a current attitude ironically presented. In Dr. Fishman's context it serves much the same purpose, and indicates the same sort of detachment. *The Disinherited of Art* is an impartial account of American critical attitudes during the past four decades. It is concerned with the various forms which dissatisfaction at the failure of American literature to develop a homogeneous tradition has taken. The diagnoses of this failure Dr. Fishman analyses in six separate but closely related essays. In the first he deals with the artist's inevitable alienation from his environment, and his attempt to use this maladjustment for creative purposes; in the second, with the various doctrines of the social function of literature widely prevalent in the thirties; in the third, with attempts to propound a national basis for American literature; in the fourth, with the regional and traditionalist approach of the New Critics; in the fifth, with efforts to align the American national tradition with that of Europe; and in the sixth with the cleavage between democratic culture and genuine literary creation. These phenomena and their relationship to American society he describes with remarkable clarity and penetration. His account of the failure of Marxist criticism is typical:

Despite great activity during a whole decade, this criticism achieved neither theoretical clarity nor a new approach. The fundamental disparity between its long-range and its short-range view of literature, for example, was never resolved. The exegetical and hortatory functions of criticism were confused; the Marxist critics failed to align their view of contemporary literature and past literature in a unified perspective.

Dr. Fishman is not directly concerned with literature, or even with specific examples of criticism. His subject is the philosophy of criticism, with particular reference to the problem of the relation of the artist to society as it appears in American letters. If he has a preference for any one approach to this problem it would seem to be that of the configurational anthropologist; but partiality never blinds him to the shortcomings of what he likes or the merits of what he does not. He is that rare bird in criticism, a sympathetic observer with no axe to grind. As he warns the reader in his introduction, no conclusions as to what should or should not be done about American literature emerge from his analysis; and this is surely because he recognizes that criticism is never less efficacious than when it is conclusive.

Whether his account of American critical attitudes is fully comprehensive it would be impossible for anyone less widely read in American literature than Dr. Fishman himself to say; but from the balance and penetration of his judgments when he happens to touch on European literature one would guess that it is so. Indeed, the remarkable thing about this study is the way in which, despite its limited and specialized scope, it commands the attention of the non-specialist. The American literary predicament is, without doubt, a peculiar one, as Dr. Fish-

man n
strikin

Chau

Enp

Dr.

poems

Prolog

cluded

a Guic

beginn

duction

duplic

which

Dr.

introd

ferred

text as

found

it is de

(A. 12

again

and if

get at

Suc

Dr. B

medie

are stu

splend

of Th

well b

left to

as this

materi

away

exam

at hir

There

He dw

B. 645

Eve

Chauc

a heav

Jane

Oxi

Dr.

which

rather

the ear

in the

later o

NORMAN CALLAN

Chaucer: The Knight's Tale. Edited by J. A. W. BENNETT. Pp. 205 (Harrap's English Classics). London: Harrap, 1954. 6s. 6d. net.

Dr. Bennett uses the Ellesmere text as his basis, but from time to time gives footnotes introducing variant readings. On the whole, for an edition of this kind, I should have preferred to omit these as they are not of much help to young students, who want as clean a text as possible. Where the editor has exercised his judgement and accepted a reading not found in most texts the best thing is to print it, and if thought worth while, to explain why it is done in the Notes. This Dr. Bennett has done, for example, at line 354 of his edition (A. 1212) where he follows the unique reading of the Cambridge Manuscript, Dd.4.24, and again at line 518 (A. 1376). The Glossary is particularly good in the way that it is set out, and if the instructions given at its head are followed, the student will find himself able to get at what he wants quickly and clearly.

Such criticism as I have to make of this edition does not really concern the merits of Dr. Bennett's work, but arises from a long-felt anxiety about editions of texts (especially of medieval writers) which presumably are for the higher forms of schools where candidates are studying Chaucer at the Advanced level for the General Certificate of Education. This splendid tale of medieval chivalry with its colour and vivid incident; its extended portrait of Theseus; its magnificent tournament; its evocation of *amour courtois* in action, might well be thought to be just the thing to attract young lovers of poetry and to deserve to be left to speak for itself. Unfortunately, it is still thought necessary to produce editions such as this, which divert the attention of young students to scholarly notes, discussion of source material, elaborate attempts to solve allusions, &c., which inevitably draw their attention away from the poem and encourage them to believe that it is of significance to know, for example, that 'neither Statius nor Boccaccio speaks of any "tempest"' ('And of the tempest at hir hoorn-cominge'); indeed, Boccaccio says the journey was made without difficulty. There are three possibilities: . . . , or 'hat 'The swoon (in ll. 55-56) is Chaucer's addition. He dwells on the poignancy of similar situations in other tales (e.g., the *Canterbury Tales*, B. 645-654, 54 ff.) . . . '

Even if we admit that in the hands of a skilful teacher something of value concerning Chaucer's artistic method can be gained from noting what he added or left out, the price is a heavy one to be paid by young students.

H. S. BENNETT

H. S. BENNETT

Jane Austen. A Critical Bibliography. By R. W. CHAPMAN. Pp. viii+62.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. 7s. 6d. net.

Dr. Chapman has once again put us into his debt; his *Critical Bibliography* is a work which all students and lovers of Jane Austen will want to possess. It is addressed to them rather than to 'the fastidious collector'; it does not repeat the full bibliographical details of the early editions given by Dr. Geoffrey Keynes, and it omits some articles already recorded in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, to which the reader is referred. (One later omission may be noted here: Dr. J. M. S. Tompkins's interesting article on *Elinor*

and Marianne' is not listed, though her review of Dr. Chapman's *Facts and Problems* receives honourable mention.) But it does include—and here it is of particular value—numerous references to Jane Austen in letters and diaries or in books of more general interest, references which are usually so hard to find. Many of these are quoted in full, others represented by short extracts; one admires the perceptive skill which has enabled Dr. Chapman to give the gist and the tone of such a passage or of a whole book by quoting a few short sentences, as one appreciates the wisdom of his critical comments.

I have indeed found only two matters of detail which raised doubts. The suggested date 1814 is too early, as Dr. Chapman has since agreed privately, for Southey and Henry Sandford to be talking familiarly of 'Miss Austen's novels, or Walter Scott's' (No. 42, p. 20); Mr. Herries only rented Montreal while its owner, Earl Amherst, was in India as Governor-General, from 1823 to 1828,² and the meeting must have taken place during those years. Again, if the lines quoted on p. 19 (No. 40) were written by James Edward Austen 'c. 1811', it is difficult to understand how he can have declared, in the 'longer poetical tribute' written in 1813, that he had then learnt of his aunt's authorship 'for the very first time in [his] life'. Might it not be that he wrote the longer tribute at once, referring to both novels then published, and later, struck with the appropriateness of the title *Sense and Sensibility* to qualities he had perceived in his aunt, dashed off the lines referring to that novel alone? The manuscript is in Dr. Chapman's possession, and he says that the writing 'might well be that of a precocious boy of about thirteen'; might it equally well be that of a boy 'not quite yet fifteen'?

WINIFRED HUSBANDS

The Sea as a Symbol in English Poetry. By JOHN BOURKE. Pp. 44. Eton: Alden & Blackwell, 1954. 7s. 6d. net.

The sea in English Literature is a subject so wide and so complex that an adequate study of it would extend to several volumes. It is to be hoped that a work of this kind may one day be undertaken.

The writer of this brief outline limits himself to consideration of a few aspects only. His account unfortunately suffers from lack of historical perspective. Every period of our literature discloses a characteristic attitude to the sea, and even in an outline such as this it would not be inappropriate to attempt a bold summary of some of the sharp and striking contrasts. The illustrative examples have been chosen too much at random, and are sometimes used in a way at variance with the poet's purpose. There is much explanatory comment that is laboured and of disproportionate length. Inadequacy of nautical and marine knowledge leads to some singularities in statement and interpretation. Neither in Nature nor in Shakespeare is there such a phenomenon as 'a perpetual state of ebb'; nor do waves have an independent movement unrelated to wind or tide. Moreover, 'after life's fitful fever he sleeps well' is not a sea image.

These defects are made worse by lapses in idiom. In English we do not 'do' a voyage; the terms 'voyage' and 'journey' are not interchangeable in sea-faring; and we do not speak of 'the fulness of flood of the Tide'.

Tennyson's *Crossing the Bar* and Clough's *Say not, the struggle naught availeth*, with their amazing artistic fusion of vision, imagination, and beauty of sound and image move the spirit with a directness and compelling power that eludes definition. The hand of the dissector can only make them into something other than they are, and do a disservice to poet and reader alike.

Some at least of the unique things in the sea imagery and symbolism of our literature might have had passing mention. Greek literature nobly reflects the wonder, the exhilaration, the terror that attend sea-going, and is rich in nautical image and allegory. But despite it all there is nothing in Greek poetry to set beside the voyage of the bark of the spirit on mystic deeps in Shelley's *Adonais* or the 'Pilot' of Tennyson's great lyric.

A. F. FALCONER

¹ *R.E.S.*, xvi (1940), 33-43.

² See E. Herries, *Memoir of . . . the Rt. Hon. J. C. Herries* (London, 1880), i. 153 n.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xxxvii, No. 2, March 1955

Swiftiana in Rylands English MS. 659 and related documents (Irvin Ehrenpreis and James L. Clifford), pp. 368-92.

Arthur Young, agriculturalist and traveller, 1741-1820. Some biographical sources (John G. Gazley), pp. 393-428.

The Reynolds copy of Johnson's *Dictionary* (Gwin J. Kolb and James H. Sledd), pp. 446-75.

Rylands English MS. 1111: an early diary of Richard Cross (d. 1760), prompter to the theatres (Harry William Pedicord), pp. 503-27.

John Ruskin: the final years. A survey of the Ruskin Correspondence in The John Rylands Library (Robin Skelton), pp. 562-86.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xvi, No. 2, March 1955

Two letters from the Newman archives (Louis Allen), pp. 57-67.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxvi, No. 1, February 1955

The critics and *The Waste Land*, 1922-1949 (Armour H. Nelson), pp. 1-15.

Direct transitivity (Gustav Kirchner), pp. 15-23.

Three suggested emendations of the Middle English Dictionary (F. Th. Visser), pp. 23-24.

Stage-Coach or 'Stage-Coach'? (Holger Nørgaard), pp. 24-25.

Vol. xxxvi, No. 2, April 1955

Shaw and Sainthood (Hans Stoppel), pp. 49-63.

The text of 'A Tale of a Tub' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 64-66.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. v, No. 1, January 1955

Codes of love and class distinctions (Macdonald Emslie), pp. 1-17.

[In Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*.]

Coriolanus: boy of tears (I. R. Browning), pp. 18-31.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

VIII^e Année, No. 1, Janvier-Mars 1955

La Tragédie Espagnole de Thomas Kyd et *Le Cœur Brisé* de John Ford (Félix Carrère), pp. 1-10.

Beckford et Byron (André Parreaux), pp. 11-31.

A fragment of Byronism (Edmund Blunden), pp. 32-42.

Extraits du 'Note Book' d'Edmund Burke (P. Baratier), pp. 43-49.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. liii, No. 4, October 1954

Design for terror in the purging of Heorot (Arthur G. Brodeur), pp. 503-13.

Percy's Folio Manuscript revalued (Albert B. Friedman), pp. 524-31.

Sir Thopas as criticism of fourteenth-century minstrelsy (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 532-45.

Chaucer's eagles and their choice on February 14 (Gardiner Stillwell), pp. 546-61.

Nature in Mandeville (A. Keith Skarsten), pp. 562-8.

[In *The Fable of the Bees*.]

Tamburlaine and The Wars of Cyrus (Irving Ribner), pp. 569-73.

The *lex aeterna* and *King Lear* (James L. Rosier), pp. 574-80.
 Notes on Wyatt and Anne Boleyn (Richard C. Harrier), pp. 581-4.
 On *H* for *R* in English proper names (John P. Hughes), pp. 601-12.

LIBRARY CHRONICLE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. v, No. 2, Fall 1954

Renaissance dictionaries in the University of Texas Library (William Peery), pp. 3-11.

THE MEDICAL PRESS

Vol. ccxxxiii, No. 5, February 2, 1955

A notable case of pulmonary tuberculosis (Anthony J. Daly), pp. 98-104.

[John Keats.]

MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. i, No. 1, February 1955

The novelist as artist (Wesley Carroll), pp. 2-8.

[Joseph Conrad.]

Conrad's *Chance*: *progression d'effet* (Robert F. Haugh), pp. 9-15.

The role of the silver in *Nostromo* (Winifred Lynskey), pp. 16-21.

Adam, Axel, and 'Il Conde' (John Howard Wills), pp. 22-25.

'The truth of my own sensations' (Walter F. Wright), pp. 26-29.

Criticism of Joseph Conrad: a selected checklist with an index to studies of separate books (Maurice Beebe), pp. 30-45.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxx, No. 1, January 1955

'Hafelan hydan', *Beowulf*, ll. 446, 1372 (Arthur E. DuBois), pp. 3-5.

The Owl and the Nightingale 258.

The semantic development of *spell* (= 'rest') (Ian A. Gordon), pp. 5-8.

Two notes on Chaucer's *Troilus* (Howard R. Patch), pp. 8-12.

Undetected verse in Mirk's *Festial* (Mary McDonald Long), pp. 13-15.

The date of John Heywood's *The Spider and the Flie* (David R. Hauser), pp. 15-18.

Elijah and Elisha in Dryden's 'Mac Flecknoe' (Baird W. Whitlock), pp. 19-20.

A manufactured anecdote in Goldsmith's *Life of Richard Nash* (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 20-22.

Keats and 'the Smith and Theodore Hook Squad' (William G. Lane), pp. 22-24.

Byron and Sterne (Earl R. Wasserman), p. 25.

An unknown Years poem (Marion Witt), p. 26.

Emerson's poem 'Pan' (B. Bernard Cohen), pp. 32-33.

A note on Hawthorne's fatalism (Joseph Schwartz), pp. 33-36.

The meaning of the match image in James's *The Ambassadors* (Patricia Evans), pp. 36-37.

Vol. lxx, No. 2, February 1955

Beowulf 3150-3151. Queen Hygd and the word 'Geomeowle' (John C. Pope), pp. 77-87.

A Middle English acrostic (John L. Cutler), pp. 87-89.

The link between pleasure and communism in *Utopia* (Edward Surtz), pp. 90-93.

'Those two brethren Giants', *Faerie Queene*, 2. 11. 15 (Allan Gilbert), pp. 93-94.

Four of Swift's sources (Irvin Ehrenpreis), pp. 95-100.

The 'American' stanzas in Shelley's *Revolt of Islam*: a source (Allan Kline), pp. 101-3.

Housman: a father-son 'collaboration'? (William White), pp. 103-4.

Henry James on *The Outcry* (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 105-6.

The prefaces of George Sand and

He
pp
Vol
On
Ma
Th
Mu
Ca
Ma
Do
log
Ma
Th
as
(H
Pop
str
pp
Th
and
pp
My
bou
182
Th
Poe
184
MOD
Vol. I
Rhet
and
Pea
'Ju
an
135
Th
(R.
A
Ge
MOD
Vol. I
Loc
ego
Th
Dic
cen
175

Henry James (Edmond L. Volpe), pp. 107-8.

Vol. lxx, No. 3, March 1955

On the etymology of *Filch* (Kemp Malone), pp. 165-8.

The name of Chaucer's friar (Charles Muscatine), pp. 169-72.

Canterbury Tales, F 1541-44 (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), p. 173.

Donne's *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Catalogus Librorum Aulicorum* (A. E. Malloch), pp. 174-5.

The *Dialogues of Hylas and Philonous* as a source in *Gulliver's Travels* (Harry C. Morris), pp. 175-7.

Pope's *Essay on Man*. The rhetorical structure of Epistle I (R. E. Hughes), pp. 177-81.

The removal of incest from *Laon and Cythna* (Ben W. Griffith, Jr.), pp. 181-2.

Myth-making in *Prometheus Unbound* (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 182-4.

Three misprints in Yeats's *Collected Poems* (Jerome S. Rubenstein), pp. 184-7.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. I, No. 2, April 1955

Rhetorical 'descriptio' in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight' (Derek A. Pearsall), pp. 130-4.

'Julius Caesar'—an earlier play, and an interpretation (Joan Rees), pp. 135-41.

The lost opening to the 'Judith' (R. E. Woolf), pp. 168-72.

A note on Henry Vaughan (Carol Gesner), pp. 172-3.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lii, No. 3, February 1955

Locke and the 'dissolution of the ego' (Ernest Tuveson), pp. 159-74.
The critical reception of Johnson's *Dictionary* in the latter eighteenth century (Gertrude E. Noyes), pp. 175-91.

Coleridge's early knowledge of German (Werner W. Beyer), pp. 192-200.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

39ste Jaarg., Aft. I, 1 Januari 1955

The Elizabethan theatre (F. P. Wilson), pp. 40-58.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lv, Nos. 7-8, 20 December 1954

A song for victory in France (1492) (Russell Hope Robbins), pp. 289-93.

Notes on English prefixation (Hans Marchand), pp. 294-304.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. ix, No. 4, March 1955

The Woodlanders, or realism in sheep's clothing (William H. Matchett), pp. 241-61.

A preface to *Middlemarch* (F. George Steiner), pp. 262-79.

Marlow's descent into Hell (Lillian Feder), pp. 280-92.

[In Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.]

The anti-romantic in *Ivanhoe* (Joseph E. Duncan), pp. 293-300.

A Charles Dickens original (Russell Fraser), pp. 301-7.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. ii, New Series, No. 2, February 1955

The first night of 'Twelfth Night' (Sydney Race), pp. 52-55.

The marriage of Richard and Anne (Norman Nathan), pp. 55-56.

[In *Richard III*.]

Shakespeare and Daniel's 'Letter from Octavia' (Holger Norgaard), pp. 56-57.

Some notes on the vocabulary of John Marston, III (Gustav Cross), pp. 57-58.

[Continued from N. & Q. ii. 20-21.]

'That two-handed engine'—again (R. E. Hughes), pp. 58-59.

Nathan Field and 'The Faerie Queene' (Glenn H. Blayney), pp. 59-60.

- The Dublin Stage, 1736-1737 (Emmett L. Avery), pp. 61-65.
- Christopher Smart's 'English Bull Dog', 'Dutch Mastiff', and 'Quail' (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 65-66.
- Smollett and Admiral Byng (Robert Donald Spector), pp. 66-67.
- Delay in publication of the second volume of Joseph Warton's 'Essay on Pope' (George Baldwin Schick), pp. 67-69.
- Edmund Burke's burial place (Bertram D. Sarason), pp. 69-70.
- Knight, Ireland, Steevens, and the Shakespeare testament (Leonard Schwartzstein), pp. 76-78.
- Abridgements of Smollett for children (Lewis M. Knapp), pp. 80-81.
- Byron and Lamartine (C. M. Lombard), pp. 81-82.
- Keats and Sandys (Joan Grundy), pp. 82-83.
- Vol. ii, New Series, No. 3, March 1955*
- The sources of 'Twelfth Night' (Kenneth Muir), p. 94.
- Shakespeare's Sonnet CXLVI (Howard Parsons), p. 97.
- An Ascham borrowing from Erasmus (George W. Hallam), p. 97.
- George Herbert and Ovid (A. Davenport), p. 98.
- A note on 'The Revenger's Tragedy' (Inga-Stina Ekeblad), pp. 98-99.
- Webster's Vincentio Lauriola (R. G. Howarth), pp. 99-100.
- Milton trickt and frounc't (Ann Gossman), pp. 100-2.
- Some Jacobean and Caroline dramatic lyrics (John P. Cutts), pp. 106-9.
- Dating Mrs. Hutchinson's translation of Lucretius (Samuel A. Weiss), p. 109.
- Defoe's 'Essay upon Projects': an unrecorded issue (John Robert Moore), pp. 109-10.
- Theophilus Cibber's 'The Humourists' (A. H. Scouten), pp. 114-15.
- A footnote to Blake's treason trial (G. E. Bentley, Jr.), pp. 118-19.
- Shelley's arrest for debt (H. M. Dowling), pp. 119-23.
- Two new Leigh Hunt letters (David E. Kaser), pp. 123-4.
- Keats and 'The Spectator' (David Bonnell Green), p. 124.
- The authorship of the letter to the 'Univers' (Louis Allen), pp. 124-6. [After Tract 90.]
- Arnold and Carlyle (Kathleen Tillotson), p. 126.
- Margaret Oliphant (Sara Keith), pp. 126-7.
- Vol. ii, New Series, No. 4, April 1955*
- Greene and 'Troilus and Cressida' (Kenneth Muir), pp. 141-2.
- Echoes of the Bible story in 'Macbeth' (Paul N. Siegel), pp. 142-3.
- 'Out, out, brief candle' and the Jacobean understanding (R. M. Frye), pp. 143-5.
- Thomas Dekker, hack writer (Edwin Haviland Miller), pp. 145-50.
- Samuel Rowlands (A. Davenport), p. 150.
- James Hay and 'The Countess of Montgomerie's Urania' (John J. O'Connor), pp. 150-2.
- Tennyson and 'The Revenge' (G. T.), p. 152.
- Traherne and a Romantic heresy (K. W. Salter), pp. 153-6.
- A textual note on 'The Changeling' (Inga-Stina Ekeblad), pp. 156-7.
- Goldsmith and 'The Distresses of an Hired Writer' (Morris Golden), pp. 164-5.
- G. F. Cooke and Shelley (W. G. Bebbington), pp. 165-7.
- Poe's concept of the soul (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), pp. 173-4.
- Skimpole and Leigh Hunt again (K. J. Fielding), pp. 174-5.
- 'Richard III' (Howard Parsons), pp. 175-6.

Falstaff a coward? (C. A. Greer), pp. 176-7.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxiv, No. 1, January 1955

Secondary sources of *The Winter's Tale* (E. A. J. Honigsmann), pp. 27-38.

The structure of *Martin Chuzzlewit* (Edwin B. Benjamin), pp. 39-47.

Technique in *Great Expectations* (Thomas E. Connolly), pp. 48-55.

Ritual and reality: mask and dance motifs in Hawthorne's fiction (Norris Yates), pp. 56-70.

The Harley Glossary and 'Saxon Patois' (Jackson J. Campbell), pp. 71-74.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xvi, No. 1, Autumn 1954

The mathematical manuscripts of Lewis Carroll (Warren Weaver), pp. 1-9.

A literary duel (Derek Patmore), pp. 10-16.

[1821: John Scott and J. H. Christie.]

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxix, No. 5, December 1954

Housman's poetic method: his lecture and his notebooks (Tom Burns Haber), pp. 1000-16.

The Wings of the Dove and *The Portrait of a Lady*: a study of Henry James's later phase (Ernest Sandeen), pp. 1060-75.

The uses of James's imagery: drama through metaphor (Priscilla Gibson), pp. 1076-84.

The original source of Hardy's *Dynasts* (John A. Cassidy), pp. 1085-1100.

Browning's *Sordello* as a study of the will (Earl Hilton), pp. 1127-34.

Carlyle and 'Irving's London Circle':

some unpublished letters by Thomas Carlyle and Mrs. Edward Strachey (Grace J. Calder), pp. 1135-49.

Charles Lamb's contribution to the theory of dramatic illusion (Sylvan Barnet), pp. 1150-9.

Coleridge's metacriticism (Howard H. Creed), pp. 1160-80.

The contrarities: Wordsworth's dualistic imagery (Charles J. Smith), pp. 1181-99.

The first draft of Percy's *Reliques* (Albert B. Friedman), pp. 1233-49.

Swift and Dr. Eachard (Robert C. Elliott), pp. 1250-7.

John Dryden's use of classical rhetoric (Lillian Feder), pp. 1258-78.

Coming back from the mere (Kemp Malone), pp. 1292-9.

[In *Beowulf*.]

Concerning the genesis of *Finnegans Wake* (Joseph Prescott), pp. 1300-2.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxiii, No. 1, Winter 1955

The Golden Bowl revisited (Francis Fergusson), pp. 13-28.

Mr. Verver, our national hero (Caroline Gordon), pp. 29-47.

The pride of Lemuel Gulliver (Samuel H. Monk), pp. 48-71.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lii, No. 1, January 1955

Moral allegory in Lyly's *Loves Metamorphosis* (Paul E. Parnell), pp. 1-16.

Shaftesbury's moral sense (Robert B. Voitle), pp. 17-38.

Mary Shelley to Maria Gisborne: new letters, 1818-22 (Frederick L. Jones), pp. 39-74.

The date of Keats's 'Bright Star' sonnet (Aileen Ward), pp. 75-85.

220

22

